

## SENATE—Wednesday, February 28, 1996

(Legislative day of Friday, February 23, 1996)

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

## PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we respond to Your invitation to enjoy these moments of conversation with You. We praise You for who You are: our creator, sustainer, loving heavenly Father. It is awesome to us that You have chosen, called, and commissioned us to be Your blessed people. Forgive us when we resist the greatness You desire for us and forget to ask for Your guidance. We thank You for the times we did trust You and did receive Your blessings of wisdom, strength, and determination. You have called us to be intercessors by placing in Your capable hands the problems of people around us. Now hear our longing to know and do Your will in the crucial matters before us. There is so much on which we do agree; show us how to come to creative compromise in issues on which we do not agree. Give us clear heads and trusting hearts. May we earn a new confidence from the American people by the way we press on expeditiously and with excellence. Now we commit ourselves anew to You. We reorder our priorities. Deliberately we put behind us self-serving manipulation and put before us our patriotic motivation. With confidence we thank You in advance for Your guidance today. In Your all-powerful name. Amen.

## RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able acting majority leader, Senator LOTT, is recognized.

## SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today there will be a period for morning business until the hour of 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each except for the following: Senator DOMENICI for up to 20 minutes and Senator MURKOWSKI for up to 15 minutes.

Following morning business, it is hoped that it would be possible to proceed to the legislation which will extend the authority for the special committee to investigate Whitewater. Rollcall votes, therefore, are possible during today's session, and the Senate may be asked to consider any other

legislative items that can be cleared for action.

Senators also should be reminded that a second cloture motion was filed yesterday on the D.C. appropriations conference report. Therefore, that cloture vote will occur during Thursday's session of the Senate, after the leaders have consulted and agreed upon a time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

## MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business until 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for 20 minutes; the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] for 15 minutes.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMENICI and Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the submission of Senate Resolution 226 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHCROFT). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY SHOULD PROVIDE QUALITY PROGRAMMING

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it has been nearly 9 months since I made a speech

in Hollywood suggesting that our entertainment industry has a responsibility to look beyond the bottom line and to not pollute our culture and our children.

That speech ignited a national discussion—a discussion which has continued to this day.

This discussion will take what I hope will be an important step tomorrow, when a delegation of entertainment industry leaders will meet with the congressional Republican leadership here at the Capitol, and then with President Clinton at the White House.

It is reported that the industry leaders will use these meetings to inform us of their decision to voluntarily create a rating system for television programs.

I certainly hope these reports are true, and that the meetings are not just publicity stunts for all involved.

While previous commitments will prevent me from attending tomorrow's meeting, I did want to take a moment to add a few thoughts to the discussion.

First, I wish to congratulate the entertainment industry leaders for their decision. Every parent knows that some television programming goes over the line—way over the line—of decency.

And I believe a voluntary rating system, if honestly implemented, will help parents in making informed decisions about what programs their children should and should not watch.

Second, let me urge the entertainment industry not to spend too much time patting themselves on the back.

It is one thing to produce programs that children should not watch, and to inform parents of the content of those programs.

But it is another thing entirely to produce programs that parents are proud to let their children watch.

That is an important distinction I hope Hollywood understands, and one they can respond to only by producing quality, family friendly programming.

Third, let me emphasize that if a rating system is to work, then it must be designed and implemented without any Government meddling or interference.

While I have taken Hollywood to task, I have also made clear that the answer is good corporate citizenship, and not Government censorship.

If the era of big Government is truly over, then the President, the Congress, and the Federal Communications Commission cannot be in the business of reviewing and rating television programs.

Finally, I believe it is very worthwhile to note that the industry's decision to voluntarily rate television programs is proof that the voice of concerned Americans is being heard.

We learned that when outraged citizens forced the Calvin Klein Co. to withdraw ads that were nothing more than child pornography, and we learn it each time a movie that assaults our values sinks at the box office.

The bottom line is that shame does work, and it will continue to work, as long as concerned Americans speak out.

And I am just one of countless concerned Americans who intend to continue to speak out for decency, for civility, and for the future of our children.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—D.C. APPROPRIATIONS CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on invoking cloture on the D.C. appropriations conference report occur at 12:30 on Thursday, February 29, with the mandatory quorum being waived; further, that the time from 12 to 12:30 be equally divided in the usual form for debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I thank the Chair, and I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 15 minutes.

#### FULLEST ACCOUNTING—VIETNAM, WHY NOT NORTH KOREA, TOO

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Members what I honestly feel is an overlooked issue relative to one of the highest responsibilities that our Government has, and that is the full accountability of those armed services personnel who have been lost in action.

We have always demanded the fullest possible accounting in Vietnam for those listed as missing-in-action, and the question that I pose today is, why not North Korea as well?

The fate of more than 8,100 American servicemen from the Korean war remains unresolved. At least 5,433 of

these were lost north of the 38th parallel. In Vietnam, by contrast, the number of unresolved cases is 2,168, and Vietnam has cooperated in 39 joint field activities.

I have a small chart here, Mr. President, that shows the unaccounted for in our foreign wars. Beginning in World War I, we have 1,648 unaccounted for; World War II, 78,794; Korea, 8,177, and Vietnam, 2,168. As I have said, out of the 8,177, 5,433 were lost north of the 38th parallel.

One can see that public opinion has prevailed in demanding a full accounting in Vietnam, and while we must maintain our commitment for accountability of all Americans who are lost, clearly, we have made significant progress in Vietnam as a consequence of a commitment and dedication to do so. So it seems strange that we would still have in North Korea a significant number of servicemen whose fates are unknown.

The United States Government recently announced plans to contribute \$2 million, through U.N. agencies, to relieve starvation in North Korea, certainly a worthy cause. The donation was consistent with other instances where the United States seeks to relieve human suffering despite disagreements with various governments in the receiving country.

But what is inconsistent with United States policy is our failure to ensure that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea addresses the humanitarian issue which is of great concern to the American people: the resolution of the fate of servicemen missing in action since the end of the Korean war, those lying north of the 38th parallel.

Relations between the United States and Vietnam—I give you this background as a reference—our relations with Vietnam did not begin to thaw until the Government of Vietnam agreed to joint field operations with United States military personnel to search for missing servicemen in Vietnam. We knew the general areas where conflicts had occurred or where aircraft had gone down. The pace and scope of normalization was commensurate with Vietnam's cooperation on the MIA issue and other humanitarian concerns.

In virtually every discussion that our Government had with their Vietnamese counterparts, the MIA issue was paramount. I know that on the numerous occasions that I visited Vietnam, that was the one message we sent loudly and clearly: You have to cooperate with us on the MIA issue; you have to allow us to bring in our personnel in the joint task force teams; and you have to cooperate with us for a full accountability, otherwise our relationship will not go any further.

So the Vietnamese received clear signals that progress and normalization of relations with the United States would

come only after significant progress was made on the MIA issue.

In contrast to our Vietnam policy, United States policy toward North Korea seems to lack this same focus with no explanation. The recent announcement regarding food aid for North Korea did not mention our interests in the MIA issue. There was no explanation as to why.

The agreed framework between the United States and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not talk about cooperation on MIA's, even though the framework commits the United States to give the North Koreans free oil and to supply two highly advanced light water reactors, a total package that exceeds \$5 billion, \$4 billion alone for the reactors and some \$500 million for the oil, not counting potential future aid for a grid system to distribute the power that the reactors will produce. North Korea simply does not have the transmission capability to handle the new reactors, so we can expect to be asked for approximately another billion dollars so that the power can go out and be distributed throughout the countryside.

The agreed framework also envisions that the United States would lift its trade restrictions and normalize relations, regardless of, evidently, any movement on the MIA issue. The most obvious difference between Vietnam and North Korea is North Korea's nuclear program; the United States has an overriding national security interest in stopping the North Korean nuclear program. Nevertheless, I do not believe that we should have ignored the MIA issue. That is why I have introduced Senate bill 1293, legislation that would prevent establishing full diplomatic relations or lifting the trade embargo until the North Koreans have agreed to joint field operations.

I recently had an opportunity to sit down with our dedicated armed services personnel in Hawaii, who are responsible for negotiating with the North Koreans on the issue. These are the people that actually negotiate relative to Americans missing in action. These are the people that identify the remains. They are very dedicated and knowledgeable people, doing a tremendous service for our country. It was clear from that briefing that joint field operations would have a high probability of success because, unlike in Vietnam, the United States has concrete evidence of the sites of mass U.N. burial grounds and prisoners of war camps located in North Korea. But United States personnel have had no access to those North Korean sites. The only thing preventing our personnel from going in and making these identifications is the Government of North Korea.

The North Koreans have been unilaterally turning over some limited remains. Unfortunately, the North Koreans, without training in the proper



handling of remains, have turned over excavated remains that have not been properly handled, that have been mixed, making identification vastly more difficult, if in some cases not impossible. Of the 208 sets of remains that have been turned over since 1990, unfortunately, only 5 sets have been identified.

Despite the United States aid flowing to North Korea, the Koreans have repeatedly attempted to link progress on the remains issue to separate compensation. In other words, Mr. President, they expect repayment above and beyond their out-of-pocket costs. These amounts of money seem far in excess of the reimbursement costs for recovery, storage, and transportation of remains.

The U.S. Government must stand by its policy not to buy remains. This would degrade the honor of those who died in combat on behalf of our country. Instead, the United States has offered to reimburse the North Koreans for reasonable expenses, as we have done in Southeast Asia over the last couple of decades. Talks to move the MIA remains and the reparation issue seem stalled at this moment. We have reason to believe that the progress is not what it should be relative to our ability to go into North Korea, to the sites where we know we are likely to find remains.

Now, the United States has been careful not to link the nuclear issue with other policy concerns in North Korea. But it is not unreasonable for the United States to consider North Korea's behavior on other issues, such as the MIA issue, when considering whether to provide humanitarian assistance to this isolated, closed nation.

I was over in Pyongyang last year and can say that, clearly, this is a country that is probably as isolated as any country on Earth. As a consequence, our inability to develop a dialog, other than that which was necessitated after the conversations concerning their efforts to develop a nuclear capability, has brought this whole picture into focus. But the bottom line is that in our negotiations we should demand that we have access so that we can address our responsibility and ask for the fullest possible accounting for those missing, those 5,433 that we believe are still unidentified in North Korea, for the families of those airmen still missing more than 40 years after the end of the conflict. There is no more humane action that North Korea could take than to let Americans have sufficient access to try to resolve as many cases as possible.

Mr. President, we have demanded the fullest accountability from the Government of Vietnam on the MIA issue, and we should demand the same of the Government of North Korea.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on the merits of the legislation I have offered, Senate bill 1293, that would prevent es-

tablishing full diplomatic relations or lifting the current trade embargo until the DPRK, the Government of North Korea, has agreed to joint field operations that would allow us to have access to those sites where we believe we can identify and find remains.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

• Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, a lot of folks don't have the slightest idea about the enormity of the Federal debt. Ever so often, I ask groups of friends, how many millions of dollars are there in a trillion? They think about it, voice some estimates, most of them wrong.

One thing they do know is that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the enormous Federal debt that is now over \$5 trillion. To be exact, as of the close of business Tuesday, February 27, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$5,016,697,045,327.39. Another sad statistic is that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America now owes \$19,041.81.

#### DEREK J. VANDER SCHAAF: A MODEL PUBLIC SERVANT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to honor a Federal bureaucrat.

Now I know that Republicans, myself included, have been bashing bureaucrats lately—mostly with good reason. Most bureaucrats could care less about the taxpayers. They have forgotten who they serve and who owns the money.

Well, I would like to talk about a different kind of bureaucrat. This one is the exception. He is unique. He is a model civil servant. He cares about the taxpayers.

His name is Mr. Derek J. Vander Schaaf.

We know him affectionately as Derek.

Derek was born and raised in a small farm town in northwest Iowa—the town of Hull.

Hull is where his Dutch parents taught him to be so thrifty, to skimp, to penny-pinch, to be honest and work hard.

Mr. President, that's what Derek is all about: being honest and fair, working hard, and saving a penny here and a penny there. But zero tolerance for waste. His Motto is: There shall be no waste, period.

This is Derek to a "T." This is what made him dedicate his life to controlling waste at the Pentagon.

This is what led him into the Office of the Inspector General.

Today, Derek is the Deputy Inspector General at the Department of Defense (DOD). He has occupied that position since it was created in December 1981.

After 33 years of dedicated service, Derek is leaving the government.

He is retiring in March.

Derek first earned a reputation as a junior junk yard dog back in the 1970's as a staff member over on the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

He was known for doing his homework.

But he was best known for plowing through mountains of DOD audit reports.

Now, Mr. President, nobody else in the whole world paid much attention to those reports—even though they were produced at great expense and contained some beautiful little nuggets.

DOD audit reports are hard to read. You have to read and re-read them 10 times or more before you can begin to understand what they say.

Well, Derek made a living reading and acting on those reports over in the House.

He would turn the nuggets into savings.

He would find a way to save a penny here and a penny there.

Pretty soon Derek was helping to save big bucks—billions of dollars, I am sure.

Derek's junk yard operation over in the House used to drive the Pentagon brass absolutely nuts.

The generals and admirals used to parade in and out of his office, trying to "correct his thinking."

Even an occasional blow with a ball-pen hammer didn't help much.

Derek was never affected by all the high-level attention. He just went about his business like a real professional.

Derek's beefs with the Pentagon always rested on firm ground.

He would skewer the brass with their own reports.

It was very hard for the brass to avoid getting nicked once Derek zeroed in on a problem.

The only thing that saved them was a full-court press lobbying effort with the Committee's members.

The end-run lobbying maneuver didn't faze Derek one bit.

He just read more audit reports and made more cuts. He stayed way ahead of the DOD posse and all the tinhorn deputies.

He just kept right on trucking—saving a penny here and a penny there.

When the DOD IG opened shop in 1981, Mr. Joe Sherick was put in charge. Joe Sherick was the original junk yard dog. He picked Derek to be his deputy dog.

Derek was the perfect choice. He had been a foot soldier in the war against Pentagon waste for 10 years. He had proven his mettle in combat, so to speak.

Derek was ready to begin leading the war on military waste. He was ready to go out on the "point."

As one of the "defense reformers" in Congress, I often turned to Derek for

help when we uncovered problems at the Pentagon.

We usually turned to Derek in the heat of battle.

We usually turned to him after getting stonewalled by the big wheels over at the Defense Department.

So right off the bat, we put Derek in the hot seat.

We asked him to investigate. We asked him to document and verify.

We asked him to tell us what really happened. We asked him for the truth.

Mr. President, I wish I knew how many times Mr. Vander Schaaf's name has been used right here on the Senate floor to prove a very important point. I have done it myself many times.

But my opponents have done it too. They have also used his work—in many instances to hammer me—and to hammer me with great success.

That is one of the reasons I admire Derek so much.

He does not always do what we want him to do.

At times, we have felt anger, frustration, and even disappointment over his work.

We have even accused him of whitewashing. But that is fine. That is the way it should be.

He runs an independent operation.

Derek is his own man. He lets the chips fall where they may.

When he looks at the evidence, he first searches for the truth.

But he also thinks about protecting the interests of the taxpayers.

He thinks about the needs of the men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

He thinks about what is right.

And, he thinks about how to succeed without getting knocked off by the brass. And that is no small feat.

Derek is a tight-rope artist.

He does a balancing act on the high wire.

He has made the trip across the high wire many times without hesitation. He never wavered and never took a fall.

Mr. President, Derek is a model civil servant. He is honest. He is tough but always fair. He knows his stuff. He dedicated his life to protecting the taxpayer's money.

Mr. President, if his parents were alive today, they would be proud of Derek's service to the people. But they would not make a big fuss about it.

They would know that he was no more and no less than what they expected him to be.

Mr. President, Derek has always set a good example—an example of excellence.

Derek is a leader. He is a man of courage. He is a man of integrity, and the people will miss him.

Mr. President, I wish him good luck and Godspeed.

And I pray that there is someone just as good ready to take over.

Mr. INHOFE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized.

#### THE NEED FOR ADEQUATE DEFENSE AGAINST BALLISTIC MISSILE ATTACK

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am speaking today, once again, about the urgent priority we have to develop and deploy adequate defenses against a ballistic missile attack.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee and Intelligence Committee, I feel it is my duty to call relevant aspects of this issue to the attention of my colleagues and the American people.

This month, we are marking the 5-year anniversary of the Gulf War. While the war was, in many respects, a great triumph, there are certainly many lessons that we should learn from that war. One of these lessons is that future conflicts will, very likely, include attacks on American forces by ballistic missiles. It is our obligation to our troops—not to mention the American people, generally—to do all we can to prepare for this reality.

Five years ago this past Sunday, a primitive Iraqi Scud missile carrying a conventional explosive warhead slammed into a barracks housing American troops in Saudi Arabia, and 28 Americans were killed, 98 Americans were injured. It was the single largest loss of lives during that war.

In recalling this event the other day, the Washington Post Style section recounted the horror of how these brave young Americans, well behind the front lines, were coldbloodedly attacked and murdered without warning. As the Post described it:

It was simply a freak of war. No ground was gained, none was defended, no tactical purpose was served, people were assassinated in their beds as they dozed or lounged or clowned with buddies. They were in a converted warehouse in the suburbs of Saudi Arabia, 200 miles behind the front line, in a neighborhood that included a supermarket, a hotel, and other buildings. The war was winding down. Two days after the attack, it would be over.

I was particularly struck by the Post's description of the victims of this incident as the "forgotten fatalities of the Persian Gulf war."

Now, it is understandable that a lot of the American people did not see this happening because, understandably, the television crews were up there in the front lines, and they were filming the last 2 days of this war. Nonetheless, it happened. I think there are a lot of people who think that perhaps it would go unnoticed. But I am here to remind my colleagues that, as policymakers and overseers of our national defense preparedness, we cannot and will not ever forget what happened in this incident. This was an unprovoked, cowardly, and feeble ballistic missile attack that gives us a glimpse of the future.

My concern is that, with a lot of people not having known and remembered that this happened, these 28 Americans will have died in vain. On the other hand, if this can be very visibly laid out in front of the American people—and I do applaud the Washington Post for bringing this to public attention this week—then perhaps this can be used to get a very meaningful, sophisticated, theater missile defense in place as everyone in Congress has asked the President to do.

Ballistic missiles are fast becoming the weapons of first choice of those who seek to harm to American interests abroad. We know, and our intelligence confirms now, that 25 nations have ballistic missiles of different degrees of technology, but the capability is there. Keep in mind, the one that murdered 28 Americans was a very primitive Scud missile. These 25 nations all have missiles that are more sophisticated than that.

Now, to illustrate this directly, I call the attention of my colleagues to recent news reports concerning communications between the United States commander in Korea, General Luck, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Shalikashvili. In this astonishing exchange, General Luck's urgent request for advanced missile defenses to protect his troops was rejected. General Luck and his forces are on the front lines facing an increasingly hostile and menacing adversary in North Korea. According to the Washington Times, General Luck warned in December that the threat to United States forces from North Korean missiles is growing and advance theater missile defenses were needed as soon as possible.

Specifically, General Luck requested that the development of our most capable ground-based theater missile defense system, the THAAD system, the theater high altitude area defense, be accelerated to facilitate rapid deployment to Korea of at least 2 THAAD batteries including up to 18 launchers. Such a system would have the potential to provide some adequate protection for our forces in the entire Korean theater. In other words, this is the very minimum that General Luck says we have to have to protect the lives of our Americans in South Korea. We have 37,000 Americans in South Korea. The report states that General Luck's urgent request for THAAD batteries was rejected. Instead, General Shalikashvili reportedly informed him that THAAD development would actually be further delayed by a period of 3 to 5 years so that limited funds could be diverted to smaller and less capable missile defense systems such as the Patriot PAC 3 system and to what was called critically underfunded areas of recapitalization.

Mr. President, I find this story to be absolutely incredible. The Congress has



been wringing its hands all year to accelerate the vital missile defense programs, especially advanced theater missile defense programs, to help commanders like General Luck. We have just passed, and the President has signed, a Defense authorization bill which expressly calls for more funding and more priority to such theater missile defense systems such as THAAD and the Navy Upper Tier.

We are not talking about a national defense system. That is very controversial. I have stood on this floor over the past year and talked, collectively, many, many hours about a national missile defense system. We are not talking about that, Mr. President. We are talking about a theater missile defense system to protect our troops who are currently over in places like South Korea from missile attack. At the very least, the threat we face is from missiles that are using what we consider right now to be very primitive technology, such as the Scud missile.

While I have been trying to carry on the debate on the national missile defense system—I am very much concerned about it—we have been losing the battle with the administration. They are convinced that we will have to adhere to the ABM Treaty. The ABM Treaty was put together in 1972, not by a Democratic administration but by a Republican administration. That was President Nixon.

Henry Kissinger felt at that time it was in the best interests of the United States of America to have a program of what was referred to as "mutual assured destruction." That is a program that would say there are two superpowers in the world. We have U.S.S.R. and we have America. If we agree not to defend ourselves, then, in theory, if one would fire a missile at the other superpower, that superpower would fire one back at us, everyone would die and everything would be fine. That was our strategy at that time. I did not agree with President Nixon and Mr. Kissinger at that time. At least it made sense because at that time we had two superpowers.

We are not talking about that now. We are not talking about a national missile defense system. What we are talking about is a theater missile defense system, and I think that America needs to know that General Luck in South Korea made the request to continue the technology advancements so that we would have somewhat of a sophisticated system just to protect those people.

These field commanders know what they are talking about, Mr. President. They are not like we are here, talking in theory and debating on these things in the abstract. They are on the ground facing the threat that exists. I remind my colleagues that the last time the Clinton administration turned down a field commander's similar request for

needed equipment was in Somalia in 1993, and it cost 18 American lives. All they asked for was armored vehicles. For some reason, we felt that was not what they needed. But, in retrospect, we now we know the field commander was right, and Americans died.

I urge General Shalikashvili, the Pentagon, and the policymakers in the Clinton administration to reconsider what is going on here. Our troops in the field are facing a threat. That threat is real. That threat is now. It has been 5 years since the devastating Scud missile attack in Saudi Arabia. We should have no illusions about what we are up against. We know what we have to do. We should do it and do it now. We have the technical know how.

The only other thing we have that would stand in the way, deterring us from responding to the urgent needs of General Luck and other field commanders, is the money. I have to say, Mr. President, I have said this many times before, I am very much disturbed over what is happening right now. We have an administration that is sending troops all throughout the world—Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, Bosnia—on humanitarian missions. Then they come back to us for emergency supplementals that we give to them. That is all we need here, to come for an emergency supplemental and give General Luck that which he needs to protect 37,000 American soldiers.

My fear is that people will think that we will forget those 28 Americans who lost their lives. The President may think we will forget, but he is wrong again. Now is the time to reverse that policy of delay in the Pentagon and continue the development of a sophisticated theater missile defense system, and do what is right.

I notice my colleague from North Dakota is on the floor. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I was thinking perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma was talking about the proposals for a national missile defense system. Since there is no Senate business pending, I thought it would be a good time to discuss the building of a \$48 billion boondoggle called star wars, but you were not talking about that, and this is not the time for that discussion.

Mr. INHOFE. I think this might be an appropriate time to have that discussion because the Senator understands that I am talking here about theater missile defense, which we all agreed we needed when we voted in favor of the second go around on the DOD authorization bill. In addition, as I said, I believe we need to proceed with a national missile defense.

Let me correct the Senator from North Dakota. It is not a \$48 billion proposition. We already have a \$40 billion investment in the essential elements a limited, but effective, national missile defense system. It would take

about 10 percent of that to make the upgrades necessary to make such a system work. For example, we have 22 Aegis ships with launching capability floating today. That technology is here. It is paid for. All we need to do is upgrade it, giving it the capability to penetrate the upper tier so that if a missile does go forth from North Korea, Iran, Syria, Russia, China, or any place throughout the world, we could protect American lives. I think any time is an appropriate time to discuss that.

Mr. DORGAN. I understand the Senator is talking about theater missile defense. We have had robust research and development funds for theater missile defense. I have supported some of that. We have had robust research and development funds for national missile defense. I have supported some of that. What I do not support is this notion that we ought to, on an urgent basis, deploy in 1999 a national missile defense that has a star wars component, a space-based component, multiple sites around the country. If you wanted to waste the taxpayers' money, that is an awfully good way to waste it.

To those who advocate creating now this new star wars or national missile defense system, I would say that if this country were threatened by a rogue nation, Qadhafi from Libya, Saddam Hussein from Iraq, or any other rogue nation, we are far more likely to be threatened by a nuclear device stuck in the trunk of a rusty Yugo parked at the docks of New York City than one delivered by a sophisticated missile. Or it is far more likely we will be threatened from another country by a small glass vial, no bigger than my hand, full of deadly biological agents.

I just think this notion of building an Astrodome over America—and it will cost \$48 billion incidentally, for something we do not need—I think we ought to think long and hard before we do that.

Mr. INHOFE. Is the Senator aware that the Taepo Dong missile in North Korea, it is believed, will be able to reach the United States by the year 2002, and actually can reach Alaska and Hawaii by the year 2000? I think that is something which the Senator would agree that our intelligence has indicated would be a threat to the United States in those time limits.

We can talk about all these other things, these social areas in which to invest our money. But if we do not stay on line and finish what we have started, what we have paid for, to develop a national missile defense system, I believe we will regret it. I agree with Jim Woolsey—and certainly Jim Woolsey is not a Republican; he was the CIA Director appointed by President Clinton—when he said our intelligence confirms there are between 20 and 25 nations that currently have, or are in various stages of developing, weapons

of mass destruction, either chemical, biological, or nuclear, and are working on the missile means to deliver them.

The Senator from North Dakota is fully aware that such technology is out there, and that many of those countries who want to sell that technology may do so and we might not have any way of knowing what is going on.

Mr. DORGAN. I would say to the Senator, a much greater threat than an ICBM from North Korea is the likelihood that some rogue country will get a hold of an air-launched cruise missile from an air platform not too far offshore, or a sea-launched cruise missile, or a ground-launched cruise missile. That would be a far more likely delivery vehicle to get. The national missile defense system is not going to shoot down cruise missiles.

In any event, we should debate this question of what is an adequate defense for this country, what are the threats, and what do we do to prepare to meet those threats. I do not disagree at all with the contention of the Senator that we should have such a debate.

The difficulty I have is there seems to be a tendency for some to embrace the biggest, most expensive, and broadest possible defense program to respond to a threat. There are many threats to this country, and I think the Senator from Oklahoma and others do a service when they raise on the floor of the Senate a whole series of defense issues and do it in a thoughtful and persuasive way. It is also helpful for others of us who switch roles sometimes and say, "Wait a second, who are the big spenders now? Where are you going to get all this money?"

We have had some experience with national missile defense. In North Dakota, they built the only antiballistic missile program in the free world's history. It was decommissioned 30 days after it was declared operational. I do not know how many billions of dollars went into that, but it was wasted because the system was closed down. It was closed down within a month after it was declared operational.

I am not suggesting that we should not invest in a lot of these issues. I supported investing \$370 million in research and development on the national missile defense system. But when the defense bill came to the floor, and the Senator from Oklahoma and others insisted on increasing that funding by over 100-percent in this year's appropriation, I said, "Wait a second, where are we going to get the money? Where on Earth are we going to get the money to increase the so-called star wars, as I call it, the national missile defense, as you call it, by over 100 percent in this year and demand it be deployed, early deployment, in 1999?"

The Senator quoted some defense and intelligence folks he knows. The Senator will recall that I held up on the floor of the Senate a chart showing let-

ters from the Secretary of Defense, who thought that funding increase was very unwise. He did not support a 100-percent increase for a star wars program, demanding early deployment in 1999, and suggesting that we use multiple sites on the ground and possibly systems in space. The Secretary of Defense did not support that. He said that was not in this country's interests.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield?  
Mr. DORGAN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. INHOFE. First of all, we have talked about this on the floor many, many times. A number of us who are on both the Intelligence Committee and on the Senate Armed Services Committee believe that this threat is imminent and real. If our intelligence confirms that we could be reached by a missile from North Korea within 6 years of right now, this is something to be called to the attention of the American people.

You might say, the big spenders, what are they spending this on? Yes, we were asking for more money to stay on course so we would have a defense system in place by the year 2000 or 2003.

Mr. DORGAN. No, no, it was 1999. If I might reclaim my time, the Senator is mistaken. The legislation that came to the floor of the Senate demanded early deployment by 1999 of a national missile defense system. The way to waste the taxpayers' money is to—

Mr. INHOFE. But that bill, of course, was vetoed by the President. And the President, in his veto message, said we do not need a national missile defense system on the timeline we are talking about. He is talking about 15 years out in the future.

I would ask the Senator, does he remember what Saddam Hussein said during the Persian Gulf war, when he stated that if he could have waited another 5 years, he would have had the missile technology to reach the United States, and that he would not have hesitated to use it? I think there should be no hesitation to conclude that some of the madmen around the world like Saddam Hussein would act the same way.

Then, only 3 weeks ago, in an article in the New York Times, references were made to statements from top Chinese officials concerning direct missile threats on Taiwan. They indicated that they could make such threats with little concern about how the Americans would react because, they said, the Americans are more concerned about protecting Los Angeles than they are about protecting Taipei.

When you get top officials talking like that, you get a sense of what we will be facing in the future. Let us just assume for a minute that maybe you are wrong. Maybe the Senator, who is very knowledgeable, the Senator from North Dakota, might be wrong. What are the consequences? I come from

Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, just last April, we had the most devastating terrorist attack in the history of terrorism in this country, in the Murrah Federal Office Building in Oklahoma City. The bomb that went off was a 1-ton bomb, the equivalent to 1 ton of TNT. The smallest nuclear warhead known right now is 1,000 times the devastation of that bomb.

Mr. DORGAN. Let me reclaim my time on that point, because I think the Senator makes the point I am trying to make. Tragically, the terrorist attack in Oklahoma City was a fertilizer bomb. The tragic terrorist attack in Oklahoma City was with a fertilizer bomb in the back of a Ryder truck. Not even a very large one, but large enough to destroy that building and kill so many wonderful Oklahoma people and others. It just breaks your heart to see that happen.

But my point is this. My point is, terrorism does not come, necessarily, as a warhead on an ICBM.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree.

Mr. DORGAN. Terrorism finds its form in dozens of different areas. The Japanese confronted a terrorist attack that could have been of such a nightmare quality that it would have been unheard of previously, with this deadly chemical agent which killed, tragically, a good many Japanese. The human toll of that attack in Tokyo could have actually been much worse than it was. Fortunately, certain circumstances intervened.

But my point is this. There are a lot of rogue nations out there. There are people with the capability to build a nuclear device. There are some with the ability to deliver the nuclear device. You can deliver a small nuclear device in a suitcase these days. You can deliver it with an ICBM. You can put it on a cruise missile. You can drive it in a car. You can plant it in a truck. Or you can create a nonnuclear device, a deadly biological agent, in a very small bottle. There are dozens and dozens of ways to terrorize this country.

One thing that anybody out there ought to understand in this world is this. If a Saddam Hussein or if a rogue country decides to launch a nuclear attack on our country, they would be vaporized instantly. We have intercontinental ballistic missiles with Mark 12 warheads. The fact is, with our combined triad of nuclear power in the sea, nuclear power in the air, nuclear power on the land, anyone who harbors the thought of engineering that kind of attack on our country will understand that they will be gone from this Earth.

That has been what for many years has prevented a nuclear attack on our country. The Senator makes the point that there are other ways to ensure our safety. We can essentially create a catcher's mitt to catch ICBM's that may be aimed at us. The catcher's mitt



over America will not catch cruise missiles. But it will not deal with the other elements of terror, including fertilizer bombs or deadly biological agents.

The question is whether we should build this astrodome over America for roughly \$48 billion. And it is not a case of spending 10 percent more because we already spent 90 percent. I should mention that the Director of the Congressional Budget Office estimated in July 1995 that the cost of a six-site ground-based national missile defense system would be \$48 billion. You go down this road and I guarantee you that you will spend tens of billions of dollars. And at the end you will have not devised a system that gives you any more cause to sleep better at night than you did yesterday.

Mr. INHOFE. Up until that statement, I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that we are almost in agreement on a couple of things. We need to do what we can to defend against terrorist attacks, whether it is fertilizers bombs in suitcases and any other way. But just because that is also a threat does not mean we should abandon our national missile system because that threat is there. The Senator talks about what our capabilities are today. The Senator talks about a dome. I am not talking about a dome. I think it is demeaning to the American people to keep using over and over again the statement "star wars." I know the President does that quite often.

Mr. DORGAN. I reclaim my time. This is my time. The reason I use "star wars" is because the proposal that the Senator and others pushed is a proposal that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I really came to the floor to speak for about 5 minutes about an economic task force. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 7 additional minutes, and for the next 2 minutes let us deal with this and let me give the statement I intend to on the economic task force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. The bill the Senator supported last year included both multiple sites on the ground and the possibility of space-based laser systems.

Mr. INHOFE. We are talking right now about going into that position. We have something in space we are concerned about, and that is our satellite technology that warns us in advance 30 minutes before it reaches the United States. If one should come from North Korea, that gives us adequate time. That technology is here now. Brilliant Eyes would tie into our ground-based radar and give us warning so we would be able to project and hit it. But we are not talking about that at this point.

We are talking about a bad missile that would reach the stratosphere. We have 22 Aegis ships that we have a tremendous investment in, and I am sure the Senator maybe disagreed with the amount of money that we invested in that to begin with. But it is here. We were in this body at the time that decision was made. They have now those out there floating. We want to get in the position that we can use that investment by having maybe three ships on the east coast and three ships on the west coast to reach into the atmosphere and hit missiles coming toward the United States. That is hardly an umbrella over the United States. But it is common sense—I still contend—that your figures are not accurate. And for approximately 10 percent more in investment than we have already made we could have a system that would defend Americans against missile attack.

Mr. DORGAN. I respect the Senator's views. And he comes with great energy, as do many of his colleagues when we have this discussion on the floor. I will be here when it comes again this year on the Defense authorization bill. I am not suggesting that we ought not be involved in these kinds of questions or issues. I could have supported a level of \$370 million of R&D for a national missile defense. I think that is a little high. But the fact is that was in the administration's budget. We agreed with that. We disagreed with adding over 100 percent to that, or increasing by 100 percent.

Interestingly enough, this comes at a time when the workhorse of our strategic defense are still effective. The B-52 bomber, for example, is a wonderful airplane. It has lots of life left. The Air Force does not have enough money. So they are putting B-52's in storage. We are going to draw down that bomber force? Why? Because we do not have enough money to retain the bomber force. You can run 25 B-52's for I think 5 years for the cost of one new B-2 bomber, as I recall.

The tradeoffs here are what I am talking about. I am not suggesting that we should not make good investment to defend this country. I am saying let us make sure that what we are doing represents the right kind of tradeoffs in the things that are necessary for this country's defense in the future.

Mr. INHOFE. I agree. I cannot think of anything more valuable when you are talking about tradeoffs than defending the lives of Americans.

The reason I brought up the thing in Oklahoma City was I was there for the 168 people who were killed, and many were dear friends of mine. The point there is that the smallest warhead known could kill 1,000 times that many. That is a real threat to Americans.

Mr. DORGAN. I understood the point the Senator was making. I think all of

us in this Chamber understand the heartbreak and the sadness which was visited on Oklahoma and Oklahoma City and this entire country by that tragedy, by that senseless violence that happened. It maybe in a lot of ways reminds us all again of how fragile things are and how easy it is for someone deranged, or some group deranged, to want to visit great damage on a country, or a region, or a city, or a people. We need to be vigilant about that. But there are a whole range of threats. We need to consider the entire range.

As always, I enjoyed the visit with the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, thank you for indulging us and sitting and listening to this exchange. But you will hear much of this exchange again when we have the Defense authorization bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, let me ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for the next 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TASK FORCE ON JOBS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we had this morning a task force that involved its work on the issue of jobs over in the Dirksen Building.

I and Senator DASCHLE and Senator BINGAMAN from New Mexico, who is chairman of this task force, were a part of it. I wanted to point out some of what we are trying to do.

This issue of Pat Buchanan moving around this country talking about jobs is not an accident. He understands what many of us understand—that the center pole of the tent for the economic debate in this country ought to be jobs. I happen to think Pat Buchanan has a few dark sides to his debate. I do not like some of the influences which I see and some of the references. But the fact is on the issue of jobs, it seems to me, the voters of New Hampshire and others responded to the issue of jobs and economic opportunity. And it is something that we have been working on in our caucus under the leadership of JEFF BINGAMAN now for about a year. Today, we are unveiling a series of recommendations on the issue of creating jobs in our country.

We have an interesting economy in America. America is still a strong country, and a wonderful place. Nobody wants to leave. People want to come here. We have some folks running for the Presidency who I think want to build a fence down there to keep people out of our country. What does that say about our country? It has a lot of problems but it is also a wonderful place and a magnet where a lot of people want to come to. We have an economy, however, where economists measure economic progress by taking a look at car wrecks, heart attacks, and earthquakes. There are economists down at

the Federal Reserve who are measuring economic strength by examining car accidents, heart attacks, and earthquakes. Hurricane Hugo added one-half of 1 percent of GDP to this country because this country measures its economic health by what it consumes and not what it produces.

In the long run the question of whether this country has a strong, vibrant, healthy economy will depend on how we produce, what we produce, and whether we have a strong manufacturing base. We have an economic system that has been redefined in our country in recent years by large international economic organizations. And they have redefined it by saying we choose to want to produce. Whether it is to produce and sell in established markets, we choose to access 20-cent an hour labor, or \$1 an hour labor, and sell the shoes, or the products from that labor, the shirts, the belts, the cars in Pittsburgh, or Tokyo, or Fargo, or Denver. The problem is that disconnects. That is a global economic circumstance that we probably cannot change very much in the broader sense but that we address with respect to additional rules because it disconnects the income from the source of production from the consumers who are going to be consuming the benefits, or the fruits of production.

The engine of progress in this country, in my judgment, is how do we create new, good-paying jobs? When people sit at the dinner table at night and talk about their lives as a family, the only question that matters is, "Are we increasing our standard of living?" And, regrettably for 60 percent of the American families, the answer is, "No. We are working harder." And over the last 20 years we are making less money, if you adjust it for inflation. There is no Government program, none that is as effective as a good job, or a substitute for a good job, that pays well.

Now, the question is, Why are we losing manufacturing jobs? Why are jobs moving out of our country? Why are jobs going overseas? And what can we do about it?

First, fair trade and fair competition. Our country ought not be ashamed ever to stand up and say we demand fair trade. We expect to compete, but we demand the competition be fair as well. When I was a kid walking to school, I knew every day that our country could win just by waking up; we were the biggest, the strongest, the best, and we could win the economic contest with one hand tied behind our back. But times are different, and we cannot do that today. And we ought to insist that fair competition and fair trade be hallmarks of our economic circumstances in this country.

Second, it seems to me we ought to change our Tax Code. I introduced some legislation, and I am introducing

more that says let us stop subsidizing movement of jobs overseas, this insidious, perverse provision in our Tax Code that says, if you close your plant here and move your jobs to a tax haven overseas, we will give you a little bonus. We will give you a tax break. We have already voted on that on the floor of the Senate, and I was unable to pass closing the tax break that says we will reward you if you move your jobs overseas. But guess what. You are going to get a chance on a dozen more occasions this year to vote on the same thing. We ought to shut down the tax breaks in our Tax Code that say to people: Move the jobs overseas and we will reward you.

Third, we ought to provide some basic incentive to create jobs here, and I propose a 20 percent payroll tax credit for those who create new net jobs in this country. Let us shut off the incentive to move jobs overseas and create incentives to create new jobs in this country.

I am not much interested in how many jobs exist in Japan or how many jobs exist in Germany or how many jobs exist in Mexico. I am interested in how many jobs exist in our country. This is an economic competition in which we are involved. It is a competition with winners and losers. It is not a circumstance where everybody wins. It is a circumstance where, if the rules are unfair and the competition is not fair, there are winners and losers. We are losing our manufacturing base in this country, and we can do something about it, the quicker the better. The task force that was headed by JEFF BINGAMAN from New Mexico is a task force that makes serious and specific recommendations that will try to create the incentives to create new jobs in this country—not elsewhere; in this country—in the future. The currency of ideas that are represented by the recommendations of that task force will be a set of ideas we will discuss over and over again in this Congress in 1996.

It will not surprise anyone to understand the anxiety that exists in our country today. People are worried. They know that they are less secure in their jobs. You can work 20 years and be laid off without a blink by some enterprises. Their jobs pay less adjusted for inflation than they did 20 years ago in many cases. So they are worried about fewer jobs, jobs that pay less, and jobs with less security, and they want something done about it that increases the standard of living in this country.

Government cannot wave a wand to make that happen, but the rules and the debate about how you create good jobs and how you stop the hemorrhaging of jobs from our country moving overseas is a debate that we ought to have right here in the center of the Senate.

We are going to have an Olympics in Atlanta in August, and everybody is

going to be rooting. We will root for all the wonderful athletes all around the world, but especially we will decide as Americans that those men and women wearing the red, white and blue are our team and we want them to do well. There is another competition that is not on the field of athletics. It is in the field of economics, worldwide economic competition to decide who wins and advances with new jobs and better opportunity and who suffers the turn-of-the-century British disease of long economic decline, who wins and who loses.

Frankly, I want us to have a plan. I want our team to win. I want our team to decide that we will compete and we will win, and we will make sure the rules are fair as we compete. That is the purpose of trying to put together a series of steps that say our intent is to try to encourage new jobs created in this country and try to discourage, through the insidious provisions in our Tax Code, the export or the shipment of good jobs in America overseas. We ought not pay for that. We ought not provide incentives to move jobs elsewhere. I tell you what. Anybody who thinks that makes sense is not thinking. And I hope we will get the Senate to think a lot about that in 1996.

Mr. President, we will be discussing at some greater length the legislation that I have introduced, and we will discuss at greater length the recommendations of the high wage task force of Senator BINGAMAN in the future as well. I look forward to those discussions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPECTER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DEWINE). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment for 1 minute and that, immediately following the reconvening of the Senate, time for the two leaders be reserved, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, no resolutions come over under the rule, the call of the calendar be dispensed with, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, and that I be recognized as if in morning business.

There being no objection, at 1:06 p.m., the Senate adjourned until 1:07 p.m. the same day.

The Senate met at 1:07 p.m., and was called to order by the Honorable MIKE DEWINE, a Senator from the State of Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry. For the benefit of those in the gallery and whoever may be watching on C-SPAN 2 and for me, too, we now have a new legislative day.



Would the Chair, without reference to the Parliamentarian, explain the procedural purpose?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To qualify resolutions to go to committees.

Mr. SPECTER. I thank the Chair and the Parliamentarian, Mr. Dove.

#### LEGAL AND ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to comment about the immigration bill which is scheduled to come before the Judiciary Committee tomorrow and, first of all, an amendment which will be offered by a number of Senators, including the distinguished Presiding Officer, Senator DEWINE of Ohio, under the leadership of Senator SPENCER ABRAHAM of Michigan, to divide the appropriations bill into two parts, that relating to legal immigration and that relating to illegal immigration.

I think it is important to do so, that the bills have independent status and that there not be an effort made to tie either bill to the other. The bill on legal immigration has no more to do with the bill on illegal immigration than, say, the telecommunications bill has to do with the crime bill. Illegal immigration is a major problem in America.

I picked the telecommunications bill not at random but because the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee walked in for a moment.

The bill on illegal immigration is a very important bill. We ought to protect our borders. We ought to take it up, in my view, separately. On the bill on legal immigration, I have already stated my intention to introduce an amendment, but I think it worthwhile to make this statement in the Chamber of the Senate so it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and my colleagues and others will have notice as to what I intend to do.

But the amendment would make the following changes. First it would increase the worldwide level of employment-based visas from 90,000 to 135,000 a year. Second, it would eliminate the fee that employers must pay for each immigrant employee they sponsor, which is now \$10,000 or 10 percent of the employee's compensation annually, whichever is greater. Third, my amendment would eliminate the fee that certain employers must pay for each temporary foreign worker that they employ.

Next, it restores the maximum length of the H visa to 6 years and the maximum length of the L visa to 7 years. Next, it restores the "Outstanding Researchers and Professors," which is a category that is exempt from the labor market screening requirement. It also eliminates the requirement that employers must pay foreign workers 105 percent of prevailing wages.

Mr. President, there has been an effort made to limit legal immigration under the general guise of protecting American workers. But I believe this bill is exactly wrong and exactly counterproductive because the kinds of people who are going to be excluded from this bill are Ph.D.'s, scientists, M.D.'s, and those who have great proficiency and capability for adding much to employment potential in this country.

In 1989-90, I sponsored the lead amendment to add people to come in people who were in demand in industry. I did that because the chamber of commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers were interested in that as a job-producing approach. Again, this year, after having meetings with extensive numbers of my constituents in Pennsylvania, both in Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, I have found that there is a tremendous demand for these highly skilled people, and that the people are not available in the United States to take the jobs. Rather than decreasing employment opportunities for American workers, the bringing in of these additional people will increase the employment opportunities.

I also say, Mr. President, that Americans should never lose sight of the fact that this is a nation of immigrants. It is something that I feel particularly strongly about since both of my parents were immigrants.

My father came to the United States at the age of 18, literally walked across Europe from the Ukraine with barely a ruble in his pocket, rode steerage, the bottom of the boat, to come to America for a better life for himself and his family.

My father was a great contributor to the United States. He did not know when he came over steerage he had a round-trip ticket back to Europe, back to France, not to Paris and the Folies Bergere, but to the Argonne Forest, where he served with great pride in the United States Army. He rose to the rank of buck private. I say that somewhat facetiously because my dad was at the bottom of the totem pole in rank but at the top of the totem pole in dedication, loyalty, bravery.

In the Argonne Forest, he sustained shrapnel in his legs, wounds he carried with him until the day he died. But he was a great American, a great contributor to this country. He was an immigrant. If he had been barred from the United States, I would not be in the U.S. Senate today. In fact, I would not be.

My mother, too, came as an immigrant, as a child of 5 with her parents from a small town on the Russian-Polish border. She, too, was a great American, raising a family. My brother, two sisters and I have had the advantage of an education in America and have been able to share in the American dream, as have so many Americans. More than sharing in the American dream, the

immigrants have created the American dream. This is a factor that I think has to be borne in mind.

I talked to my distinguished colleague, Senator SIMPSON, about this bill. Senator SIMPSON made the unusual effort of coming to see me twice. When Senator SIMPSON walked in, he said, "I've been here for lunch frequently with the Wednesday Group, but I never looked at the pictures." I showed Senator SIMPSON a picture of Mordecai Shem, my mother's father, who came in 1905, another great American. I showed him a picture of my father in military uniform marrying my mother in St. Joe in 1919.

I said to Senator SIMPSON, "I'm going to agree with you on just about nothing on this immigration bill." I think the future of our country is wrapped up in inviting these highly skilled, highly trained immigrants to create more jobs and more prosperity in America.

#### AN OMNIBUS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I am optimistic today that the Congress will move forward with an omnibus appropriations bill to cover the departments now not covered in existing legislation. I have been particularly concerned about what has happened to the subcommittee of Appropriations which I have the honor to chair, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. The absence of an appropriations bill in these departments has been very, very, very problematic.

It has been impossible for the Secretary of Labor to plan on worker safety and impossible for the Secretary of Education to advise various States as to the allocation of their funding. It has been impossible for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make allocations on very important items, although we have taken some items out like the National Institutes of Health, where we have maintained, again, an increased appropriation on that very important line.

I had scheduled last week a hearing of the three Secretaries to outline the needs of their Departments and to the approaches which they might be able to take. I deferred that hearing because, in the absence of knowing how much the additional funding would be, it was impossible to have that hearing in a meaningful way.

I had been in touch with the Chief of Staff, Leon Panetta, on a number of occasions spreading over several weeks trying to push ahead to see to it that we had an opportunity to construct this legislation well in advance of the March 15 date when the current continuing resolution would expire.

As a matter of fact, I even made an effort to talk to Chief of Staff Panetta when he was traveling with the President recently, when he traveled Friday

to Wilkes-Barre, where the President was due to stop to look at flood damage in Pennsylvania, which was very extensive. There is flood damage all over the State, not only with the Susquehanna in Wilkes-Barre, the Lackawanna River in Scranton, and the Susquehanna through central Pennsylvania, very great damage off Dauphin and Cumberland counties, other places, Pittsburgh as well, and western Pennsylvania.

When the President came to Wilkes-Barre, he was scheduled to have Mr. Panetta with him. I thought I would be able to get the facts there. But Chief of Staff Panetta had left the party, so I had a chance to talk with the President about the additional funding. The President was in agreement we needed to do just that.

Yesterday I was advised that there would be an additional \$4.5 billion in budget authority, slightly in excess of \$1.7 billion in budget outlays, so we can go ahead.

I am looking forward to rescheduling the hearing with Secretary of Labor Reich, Secretary of Health and Human Services Shalala, Secretary of Education Riley, to make a determination as to where those funds ought to be added.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to Chief of Staff Leon Panetta dated February 20, 1996, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, February 20, 1996.

Hon. LEON PANETTA,  
Chief of Staff, the White House, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR LEON: I called again this morning to try to find out from you the possible offsets to add approximately \$3.3 billion for appropriations for my Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. As you know, when we talked the week before last, you expected to be able to identify those offsets by last Tuesday. When I caught up with you on Friday, you thought the offsets could at least be identified by today.

As I had mentioned to you, a Subcommittee hearing has been scheduled for February 21 to hear from Secretary Reich, Secretary Shalala and Secretary Riley to try to structure an appropriations bill which the President would sign with the additional funding.

I believe it is advisable to defer that hearing until we can identify the amount of the additional funding and the offsets so that we can pass a bill in advance of the March 15 expiration of the continuing resolution.

As I have said on many occasions, I think it is very important that we move ahead on these preliminary steps forthwith because I anticipate many controversial issues in the Senate floor debate and then a House-Senate conference which could take considerable time.

As I mentioned to you when we talked Friday afternoon, I had hoped to see you in Wilkes-Barre with the Presidential party, but I understood you had to leave in advance of that stop.

At Wilkes-Barre, I discussed with President Clinton the urgency of identifying these offsets. The President said he had already discussed the offsets with you and agreed on the importance of moving ahead promptly to identify additional funding for these three important departments.

As soon as you can advise me on the additional funding and the offsets, we shall move ahead to reschedule the hearing.

Sincerely,

ARLEN SPECTER.

Mr. SPECTER. In the absence of any other Senator on the floor, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 1996

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in recess until the hour of 11 a.m. on Thursday, February 29, and that immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and that there be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator MURKOWSKI for 15 minutes, Senator DORGAN for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO REPORT LEGISLATION REGARDING SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON WHITEWATER

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules have until the hour of 5 p.m. today in order to report legislation regarding the Special Committee on Whitewater.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2196) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler technology cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1494. An act to provide an extension for fiscal year 1996 for certain programs administered by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2196. An act to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 with respect to inventions made under cooperative research and development agreements, and for other purposes.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 520

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. FAIRCLOTH] was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit for adoption expenses.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to clarify the liability of certain recycling transactions, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restructure and replace the income tax system of the United States to meet national priorities, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFF] was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to place restrictions on the promotion by the Department of Labor and other Federal agencies and instrumentalities of economically targeted investments in connection with employee benefit plans.

S. 837

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. NUNN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. LAUTENBERG], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLINGS] were added as cosponsors of S. 837, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 250th anniversary of the birth of James Madison.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 215

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. ABRAHAM] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 215, a resolution to designate June 19, 1996, as "National Baseball Day."

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 224

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of



Senate Resolution 224, a resolution to designate September 23, 1996, as "National Baseball Heritage Day."

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. NUNN, Mr. DODD, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. Res. 226. A resolution to proclaim the week of October 13 through October 19, 1996, as "National Character Counts Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'AMATO:

S. Res. 227. An original resolution to authorize the use of additional funds for salaries and expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 226—RELATIVE TO NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK

Mr. DOMENICI (for himself, Mr. NUNN, Mr. DODD, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. KEMPTHORNE, Mr. DORGAN, and Mr. FRIST) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 226

Whereas young people will be the stewards of our communities, nation, and world in critical times, and the present and future well-being of our society requires an involved, caring citizenry with good character;

Whereas concerns about the character training of children have taken on a new sense of urgency as violence by and against youth threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the nation;

Whereas, more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character, and that character counts in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by youth-influencing institutions and individuals to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, efforts by faith communities, schools, and youth, civic and human service organizations also play a very important role in supporting family efforts by fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas the Senate encourages students, teachers, parents, youth and community

leaders to recognize the valuable role our youth play in the present and future of our nation, and to recognize that character is an important part of that future;

Whereas, in July 1992, the Aspen Declaration was written by an eminent group of educators, youth leaders and ethics scholars for the purpose of articulating a coherent framework for character education appropriate to a diverse and pluralistic society;

Whereas the Aspen Declaration states that "Effective character education is based on core ethical values which form the foundation of democratic society";

Whereas the core ethical values identified by the Aspen Declaration constitute the 6 core elements of character;

Whereas the 6 core elements of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, justice and fairness, caring, civic virtue and citizenship;

Whereas the 6 core elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the Aspen Declaration states that "The character and conduct of our youth reflect the character and conduct of society; therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model the core ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character";

Whereas the Senate encourages individuals and organizations, especially those who have an interest in the education and training of our youth, to adopt the 6 core elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society as a whole; and

Whereas the Senate encourages communities, especially schools and youth organizations, to integrate the 6 core elements of character into programs serving students and children: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate proclaims the week of October 13 through October 19, 1996, as National Character Counts Week, and requests the President to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups to embrace the 6 core elements of character and to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me open this by sending a resolution to the desk and asking that it be appropriately referred. It is now sponsored by 10 Senators. It will have the requisite 50 or 60 signatures within a month and thus can get reported out of the Judiciary Committee.

The original cosponsors of this resolution have been consistent supporters of this resolution.

I am very pleased that Senators NUNN, DODD, COCHRAN, MIKULSKI, BENNETT, LIEBERMAN, KEMPTHORNE, DORGAN, and FRIST, as members of the Senate Character Counts Working Group, are again joining me as original cosponsors of this resolution.

This resolution requests that the President of the United States proclaim the week of October 13 through 19 as "National Character Counts Week." I want to discuss with the Senate and those interested in what we say here what Character Counts is all about in our country and what the movement for Character Counts is all about.

I send the resolution to the desk as previously requested, and I ask for its referral to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

Mr. DOMENICI. Many exciting and unique character education programs have taken place over this past year. As important, thousands of young people, local and national organizations, schools, parents and citizens have participated in efforts to make their communities aware of the positive benefits of character education.

One example is 12-year-old Carrie Beeman from the Roswell, NM Mountain View Middle School. Carrie will be coming to Washington, DC as 1 of 104 young Americans to be recognized for their service to their communities in the national Prudential Spirit of Community youth volunteer awards program. She received a \$1,000 for her work in the Chain of Character contest by helping organize and selling 14,000 chain links to raise funds for the local character education efforts in Roswell. By calling businesses and other interested citizens, she helped raise \$400 for her school's student council and \$2,000 for her town's local Character Counts program.

Carrie's effort personifies the great national grassroots movement to support character programs: No matter the age, everyone can participate at the local level to help promote good character in their schools and in their communities. All of us in New Mexico who are working at the local and State level to promote character education programs are very proud of Carrie and are deeply appreciative that the selection committee for the Prudential awards recognized her fine efforts.

There are many reasons why the character education movement is gaining such momentum, and let me mention just a few that bear attention.

First let me talk about violence on television and a recent study of that. Let me take a couple of moments of time to talk about this to the Senate.

A recent comprehensive study commissioned by the National Cable Television Association—National Television Violence Study—articulates some disturbing statistics. Among the study's findings were that: Perpetrators of violent acts on TV go unpunished 73 percent of the time; 47 percent of all violent interactions show no harm to victim, and 58 percent depict no pain. Longer term consequences—such as financial or emotional harm—were shown only 16 percent of the time; few programs containing violence, just 4 percent, emphasize nonviolent alternatives in solving problems.

As depicted on television, violence inflicts little pain and minimal consequences for actions that hurt, maim, and kill. Such actions glamorize abhorrent behavior that shouts "it's OK" to

be irresponsible, dishonest, and violent. Responsibility, respect, or caring apparently do not have enough public appeal to ensure high viewer ratings.

Another example of why so many are concerned about the values of America is the findings of a 3-year study just completed by the Josephson Institute of Ethics for their 1996 Report Card on American Integrity. Anonymous, written surveys were administered nationally in schools and during various programs conducted by the institute that included responses from 5,740 high school students, 2,289 college students, and 3,190 adults not in school. Basically, the survey revealed that very high percentages of young people, as well as adults over 25, have fallen into such habits as lying, cheating and stealing. For example: 42 percent of high school male respondents and 31 percent of high school females said they had stolen something from a store within the previous 12 months; nearly half the high school males and one-third of the high school females—41 percent of high-schoolers overall—said they would lie if they thought it necessary to get or keep a job; 1 in 4 adult respondents, 2 of 5 collegiate respondents, and over half the high schoolers said they would or probably would lie about their debts to get a badly needed loan; and more than half the males and one-third the females said it is sometimes justified to respond to an insult or verbal abuse with physical force, with nearly half of all high school respondents saying they had struck another person or used physical force within the previous year.

And, adding another dimension to these findings, it is likely that the real percentage of those actually engaging in dishonest conduct is higher than that reflected in the Josephson Institute's study. Why? Because 41 percent of high school respondents, 37 percent of collegiate respondents, and 25 percent of those respondents not in school admitted to giving a dishonest answer to at least one or two survey questions.

Just these two studies alone suggest that good character habits are not being emphasized or practiced by significant numbers of young and adult Americans. At the same time, the Josephson Institute's survey showed that 96 percent of not-in-school adults said that being ethical in all aspects of their lives is very important, but only 64 percent of the high schoolers said they place such a high value on ethics. I would suggest that while the high schoolers numbers are not nearly as high as they should be, at least there is acknowledgment that being ethical is desirable and important.

I do not believe that America is made up of liars, cheats and thieves. In fact, I believe that most Americans want to do well by their fellow citizen. At the same time, exemplary behavior is not a genetic trait—it needs to be taught.

Being responsible, caring, honest, or trustworthy needs to be reinforced by parents, schools, community organizations, and adults. This is what we mean by character education. And, it takes everyone's participation to make it work.

Mr. President, about 3½ or 4 years ago, as I stated here on the floor before, a group of Americans from all walks of life—from various religions, from commerce, from labor organizations, housewives—met in Aspen, CO. They issued a declaration, which is now known in some parts as the Aspen Declaration. The Aspen Declaration is the result of 3½ days of intensive evaluation by this broad spectrum of Americans.

The conclusion that they reached is that there was a serious shortage and diminution of basic character among the American people which was frightening, and in particular they were frightened about what was happening to young people, who did not seem to have any values nor any idea of what character was all about.

The conclusion of the declaration was that we should promote across America what is now known as "the six pillars of character." There are many organizations and many institutions who are looking at character building.

We chose here in the Senate to pass a resolution 2 years ago—and it has been done 2 years in a row—asking Americans to recognize for 1 week in October a week promoting Character Counts. While for many of us we have gone further, there are no laws to be passed. This is not a legislative function. But many of us have chosen to exercise our leadership in conjunction with others to establish in our communities, or our States, the idea that a community and the schools should be part of promoting Character Counts.

There are six pillars of character, the six words that are being used across this land, in our schools, in businesses, in institutions like the YMCA, and myriad organizations: "Trustworthiness," that is a root word that carries with it such things as honesty, integrity, living up to your commitments; and the words respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.

While the ultimate goal of these six principles is being celebrated in parts of America, it is catching on and taking hold more than anywhere else in the schools of America. I will just tell you, Mr. President, in New Mexico, on a volunteer basis, without a mandate, we now have 11 communities and 2 counties that have adopted Character Counts as community goals with an emphasis on the six pillars.

I say to my friend who will speak soon, who is an advocate of Character Counts, there are now scores of public schools in New Mexico. You can tell whether they are a Character Counts

school because if you drive by and if they have anything out front that indicates messages about the school, you will find on that message board the character of the month, and you will see up there "responsibility." You can then find out and be assured that if you attended that public school for that month in all the classes, be it math, English, geography, or whatever it is in the grade schools, you will find teachers have been empowered to insert into the classroom that word "responsibility."

It is a marvel to observe, to go to a school and talk with the teachers who have been empowered on a volunteer basis to promote as part of their education mission character and the six pillars of character. There are innovative ways of involvement that are occurring, but let me suggest that we have not yet received in my State and a few States I have visited, any objections from the adult community to promoting these six pillars of character.

Now, is there going to be an objection raised to trying to define "trustworthiness" and get it across to our young people? Is there going to be an adult objection to "respect," to "responsibility," to "fairness," to "caring," to "citizenship"? We have found nothing.

So what we have done by using the Aspen Declaration and the current idea of six pillars of character is to open the window and let into our public schools, if they want to, on a volunteer basis, principal by principal, empower our teachers to bring into the classroom some very fundamental things that most Americans are excited to think about. There is much being said about anxiety in the current political campaign, and I submit there may very well be the anxiety spoken of about jobs and whether or not jobs are in jeopardy because of a changing American economy, but there is another anxiety that is very big and very powerful, and it is the anxiety of adults over what is going to happen to our children if somehow or another values or pillars of character are not brought into their lives to compete with the bombardment of ideas coming from whatever source young people are currently subject to, from television to what they see and what they read. And ultimately in a State like mine, we have concluded that you need to bring adults and kids together and you need to have adults concerned about the same six pillars of character which I have repeated now several times in this Chamber.

In our State, it is contagious. Teachers have gone to classes to get the basic principles of how you promote these in the classroom. They have been given that education free by various groups that have raised money. They have all committed to teach another



teacher. And the work, how they put this together, is beginning to evolve with little direction from the national organization which is more like an umbrella. This is all going to be done locally by schoolteachers and principals and boards of education and business leaders who want to change the character of the community. It is exciting. It is not the answer to everything, but it is a start. I am certain the Senate and the House will once again declare the week as Character Counts Week, but it is more interesting to note that from that seed a few years ago, a number of Senators and Congressmen have decided to work with mayors and Governors to begin to promote not 1 week but all year long, not 1 day but every day in the classrooms of our schools one of these pillars of character to be brought into the common language of the children and their daily experience. The innovativeness of teachers who are empowered to do this is absolutely magnificent. They are out there with new and better ideas on how to instill such a thing as responsibility in young people, or such a character trait as fairness, or such a quality as trustworthiness. It is truly exciting.

Actually, in our State, in the city of Albuquerque and its public school system, the largest in the State by far, it has been approved by the board of education and they say any principal and school that wants to do it, do it. We have gone down to two other areas next in size, the county where the principal city is Las Cruces and they are starting it, in the county of Dona Ana. The adults get together from all walks of life under our format and start a council. The schools are then involved, the churches are involved, and other organizations.

I do not want to overstate the case because this is a complicated world that our young people are being raised in. It is a fearsome and frightening world for young people. Some around here know I raised a very large number of children. I have eight, the youngest of which, twins, are 28. I am quick to say to groups that they would have a very difficult time today, much more difficult today than even 15 years ago. The pressures are enormous.

This Character Counts idea, this idea of promoting the six pillars and getting them out there as a buttress to the disorder that is around our children, is exciting. There are many comparable things occurring, and by these comments I do not mean to belittle any others. But it works. Character Counts education works.

As experience has shown in my home state, New Mexico, character education can be embraced by the young and old and the public and private sectors in a way that transcends political, cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences. Because like our Federal deficit, what I would call a national "char-

acter deficit," transcends all differences. And, as I know we can and must bring our Federal books into balance, we can and should work to end our national character deficit, especially among our younger citizens.

In New Mexico, I am proud to say that Character Counts is growing by leaps and bounds. The State of New Mexico received one of the four grants from the Department of Education to States to develop character education pilot programs. This pilot program came about as a result of an amendment we offered last year to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and I thank my good friend and colleague Senator DODD for his assistance in helping pass this amendment. The communities of New Mexico want character education and they have brought it into their schools, local social and civic organizations, city governments, churches, and parent-teacher organizations to develop Character Counts community programs.

There are 11 cities and 2 entire counties who have adopted the program, with 3 more on-line to start-up in a few months. These efforts consist of leadership councils that develop programs that encompass every aspect of community life to reinforce the Character Counts message. The schools develop their curriculums to accommodate character training in each class; there are billboards on the streets that proclaim the support and importance of the program; there are public events to raise money to support the programs; and there are media events to publicize the programs. Let me cite just a few examples of activities in New Mexico. I just received a letter from the University of New Mexico's Department of Intercollegiate Athletics. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of their letter be printed at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMENICI. The Department has many plans to emphasize the Character Counts Program by promoting the messages on the university arena message boards for the men's and women's basketball games, putting the message on marquee boards on our major highways, and through public address announcements at the basketball, baseball, and softball games.

A letter from Janice Argabright, the teaching principal of the San Antonio Elementary School, who said:

We stress a family atmosphere at our school where we all help each other. Many of our students are farm/ranch kids, who have many chores to do after school. We would like to continue to instill these values. We recently began the Character Counts Program in our school. The parents and students applauded this action. Our Social Studies teacher has been going over the six fundamental core elements of good character. In fact, the students do character analysis on

certain prominent people and TV role models. They found out that Bart Simpson isn't so cool after all.

Moreover, the San Antonio Elementary School incorporated this Character Counts in the DARE program and as the principal said, the students saw the words every day and practiced them and they came to "understand the meanings and the traits that show a person of character." As an attachment to the letter, the students signed an invitation to come visit their Character Counts Program, even though they knew I was very busy in Washington, DC. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOMENICI. The ethics officer for the Sandia Laboratory in New Mexico, John Dickey, sent out a message to the employees seeking volunteers who are interested in introducing Character Counts to kids ages 2 to 12 in their churches, social clubs, and community activities. Within 48 hours, Mr. Dickey received 36 responses from employees who offered their help.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development held its State conference for educators in Las Cruces. The theme of the meeting was "Character Education for Entire Communities." And, the New Mexico State Education Department is conducting character education and Character Counts in a series of four 1-day workshops throughout the State.

The Albuquerque public school system is instituting middle school athletic programs. Character Counts is being used as the underlying basis for this citywide athletic program as coaches and referees are hired and players recruited. The Character Counts logo will be displayed on the sports uniforms.

Terry Linton of the State Referees Association instituted a "Character Counts Code of Conduct" for players, parents, coaches, and referees. This code will be instituted into the local soccer and little leagues.

Last year, Character Counts in Chavez County, NM, was featured on a nationally televised program with Peter Jennings entitled "Children First—Real Solutions for Real Problems." As a result of the outstanding success of the Roswell and Chavez County efforts, over 1,000 telephone calls flooded into my local office from all over the country and Canada about how to set up a communitywide Character Counts Program.

Mr. President, Character Counts in New Mexico is a statewide and communitywide effort. This is a program that has unbelievable energy because everyone that hears about it believes in it and wants to make it work. This

is a program for our children with thousands of committed adults working to make it a reality. This is the best example of grassroots dedication and participation I have seen in many years.

As in the past years, I urge my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring and passing National Character Counts Week. It supports America's children, families, and the entire community. It is one of the best things we can do to encourage and promote something that is good and right.

## EXHIBIT 1

LOBOS,

THE UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO,  
Albuquerque, NM, February 21, 1996.

MARTY WILSON,

APS Coordinator for Character Education, Albuquerque Public Schools, Albuquerque, NM.

DEAR MARTY: I am pleased to inform you that the University of New Mexico Department of Athletics is extremely excited and willing to help promote the Character Counts program. In response to your request for our participation, the Department of Athletics, as of February 13, 1996, is supporting this program by running messages on the following advertising/promotional vehicles:

- (1) University Arena Message Boards (UNM Men's & Women's basketball games).
- (2) Marquee Board on University & Stadium Boulevards.

We are also mentioning this program through public address announcements at:

- (1) UNM Men's basketball games.
- (2) UNM Women's basketball games.
- (3) UNM Men's baseball games.
- (4) UNM Women's softball games.

This is a tremendous program that we are pleased to support and we hope our efforts will help to communicate the message of the Character Counts program within our community. Please contact me if there is any way we can help to further promote this program.

Sincerely,

SEAN JOHNSON,  
Assistant Marketing Director,  
UNM Athletic Department.

## EXHIBIT 2

SAN ANTONIO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL,  
San Antonio, NM.

Senator PETE DOMENICI,  
Sunbelt Plaza Complex,  
Las Cruces, NM.

DEAR SENATOR DOMENICI: San Antonio Elementary is a small rural school located in San Antonio, New Mexico, about 75 miles South of Albuquerque, New Mexico. The population of our school averages about 80 students, Kindergarten thru Fifth Grade. We stress a family atmosphere at our school, where we all help each other. (You visited our school about 8 or 9 years ago). Many of our students are farm/ranch kids, who have many chores to do after school. The community of San Antonio still believes in the "family". We would like to continue to instill these values. We recently began the Character Counts Programs in our school. The parents and students applauded this action. Our Social Studies teacher has been going over the six fundamental core elements of good character. In fact, the students do character analysis on certain prominent people and T.V. role models. (They found out that Bart Simpson isn't so cool after all).

Our school emphasizes the good in all. We try to build self-esteem in each student. We do this through different programs, like the D.A.R.E. (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) program. The students have even painted pillars with the 6 core elements—Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring and Citizenship in our hallway. The students thought that if they saw the words everyday, they would practice them. They have come to understand the meanings and the traits that show a person of character.

We would very much like to have you visit our school in the near future to foster Character Development in our students. It would mean so much to them to have someone in your position visit. It would also be nice to have a representative from the Character Counts Coalition visit. I read a while back that Tom Selleck visited an Albuquerque Elementary school with you. San Antonio Elementary School is just as important!

Sincerely,

JANICE ARGABRIGHT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Mexico for the substantial amount of leadership he has provided on Character Counts for some long while now.

I had a friend ask me, "What province is it of the Senate to be teaching about pillars of character? That is not the job of the Senate." I said, "No, that is not the job of the Senate. It is the job of everyone in this country. Every single American, especially every single American parent, ought to be preaching the pillars of good character."

I have a couple of young children, so I know firsthand how difficult it is for children to navigate through the influences of today's popular culture, trying to understand what is right and what is wrong. And there is nothing that is more important to children than example, the example set by their parents, the example of their neighbors, their community, their churches, and so on. Sadly, the evidence is all around us that our children apparently do not have the good examples they need. There is coarser language. There is more violence. There is more truancy. There seems to be less respect.

I am not going to describe all of the villains that cause that. Much of it is, I assume, caused by a lack of attention at home and a lack of good example. George Will wrote a column this past Sunday, titled "With 'Friends' Like These . . .", in which he described the dialog on the popular Thursday evening show "Friends," which is shown at a time when children are watching. I ask you, look at the language in this television show and then ask yourself, what is a 12-year-old or 14-year-old to make of popular culture that sends them these messages?

I wrote a letter in October to the president of a television network in America. I was prompted to write because, the night before, our television had been tuned in to the most popular

sitcom. During that television program, which showed at 9 o'clock here in Washington, but at 8 o'clock in my home State of North Dakota, when presumably a lot of children would be watching, they used the full word that is abbreviated by SOB 12 times during the half-hour program.

I was so angry about this that I wrote to the president of the network and received a letter back from him; I wrote back and received another letter, and I have since talked to the president twice at various meetings. I asked him, by what standard do you decide to send this into living rooms across the country at a time when children are watching television? What has happened that says to us that it is all right to entertain adults even if it hurts our kids?

I have been more interested in television violence and in fact, I have introduced legislation along with the Senator from Texas, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, to address this problem. But I am also concerned about language and other things, especially on television, that say to our children that it is all right to be a smart aleck and all right not to be respectful and all right to use this kind of language.

I worry a lot about that. So I simply say what all of us are saying with this resolution, that character does count. Those organizations that are involved in the Character Counts effort have taken the Aspen Declaration and said, here are the pillars of character that should be valued in our country. We want everyone in our country—parents, teachers, churches, business leaders—to be working to try to teach these pillars of good character.

Those who say that this is not the Government's job are right, this is everybody's job. This effort is not about legislation. It is not about creating rules. It is not about saying to anyone, "Here is what the Government thinks." It is about encouraging the teaching by everyone of the pillars of good character.

The Senator from New Mexico described what those pillars of good character are. But let me just mention them again because I do not think we can mention them often enough—trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship.

Over the last 30, 40, 50 years things have changed a lot. Kids in America used to watch "Leave It To Beaver" on television. Now it is "Beavis and Butthead." Compare the contents of these two programs and ask yourself, what are our children listening to? What kinds of things are they seeing? What are they learning about the way adults act and think and behave? And then ask yourself, is there not a reason for all of us to want to support and welcome the efforts of the Senator from New Mexico and the many groups that are promoting the teaching of the pillars of good character?



This effort asks parents and teachers and everyone in this country to care a little more about what our kids are hearing and seeing and to suggest to school leaders and others that teaching the pillars of good character will build a better country.

Mr. President, I know there are others who want to cosponsor this resolution. And I will end as I began by thanking the Senator from New Mexico for providing leadership on this issue here in Congress. But the issue did not start here. The issue started with some thinkers and some concerned people around this country who got together and evaluated the problem, and developed a solution in which we to try to create and nurture an environment for teaching the pillars of good character. Let me congratulate all of these leaders and pledge my support and continued work to further their efforts.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and a bipartisan group of my colleagues in cosponsoring this Senate resolution designating October 13-19 as National Character Counts Week.

This morning, like every morning before it and every morning to come, young Americans are headed off to learn their three R's—reading, writing, and arithmetic—in our Nation's schools. But as we know, the school day involves more than just the transmission of facts or the relaying of concepts. It's also about character. In the best classrooms in America our children are given the opportunity to learn and practice basic character traits such as sharing, cooperation, and respect.

The Character Counts initiative calls on all Americans to embrace the development of six attributes—trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship—as a fundamental aspect of our children's education and as a critically important means of strengthening our Nation. The lessons our young people learn as children are the ones that will stay with them the rest of their lives. As Eleanor Roosevelt once said: "Character building begins in our infancy, and continues until death."

We live in a time when teenage pregnancy and juvenile crime are spiraling out of control. A recent poll suggests that two-thirds of Americans believe most people can't be trusted, half say most people would cheat others if they could and in the end are only looking out for themselves. These statistics and the seeming erosion in the basic norms of civility, even among our Nation's children, are ample evidence of the need for programs that promote character development.

No one would argue that Character Counts is a panacea for these complex problems. First and foremost, we need better education, stronger families,

and healthy doses of individual responsibility.

Clearly the primary obligation for the building of our children's values and belief systems lies with our Nation's families. There is only so much government can do. But, with parents being forced to spend more and more time out of the house, our Nation's schools can and should play a positive role in helping to build character among America's children.

There is nothing inappropriate or heavy-handed about teaching character in our schools. These programs don't impose morality or any one group's world view. These programs teach honesty, courage, respect, responsibility, caring, citizenship, and loyalty, attributes that I believe all Americans agree upon.

These principles transcend religion, race, philosophy, and even political affiliation. For those Americans who share the goal of energizing our democracy and strengthening our Nation's character these initiatives are simply common sense.

What's more, these programs garner tangible benefits. In Connecticut, the Southwest Elementary School in Torrington implemented a character education program in September and has already seen positive results from its students. Attendance is up, students are more respectful toward their teachers and school administrators are convinced that Character Counts is responsible. The school engages parents in the effort, who along with educators and the students themselves, love the program.

While character education may not be a magical solution to all America's problems, it represents a positive effort to make a real difference in our children's lives. Character development programs for our children strengthen our lives, our communities, and our Nation as a whole.

I commend my friend and colleague from New Mexico for all of his work in this area. And I invite all my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to join us in supporting character education as a vital means of molding better individuals, strengthening families, and creating a responsible American citizenry.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat—and especially Senator DOMENICI—in submitting this year's resolution to designate the week of October 13 through 19 as Character Counts Week.

The Character Counts Coalition is gaining momentum across the country, and I am proud to be a part of that effort.

With core members such as the American Red Cross and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America, Character Counts now includes over 80 member organizations whose efforts are reach-

ing more than 40 million children, educators, and youth development professionals.

Mr. President, the Character Counts movement—which emphasizes trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship—seeks to teach the core elements of good character to our Nation's young people.

In today's world of widespread abortion, rape, divorce, illegitimate births, and violent crime, such a movement has never been more timely.

In my home State of Tennessee, many citizens have joined the call for character renewal.

In the Franklin and Bradley County school systems, my friend, Mr. Skeet Rymer, has responded the Lessons of Life essay program, based on a model developed by Mr. John Templeton of the Templeton Foundation.

In that program, students write essays examining their own lessons of life, and develop values that will lead them to fulfilled and productive lives.

Reactions from teachers and school board members, such as Lois Taylor, show just how important this program is. She tells us that through the essay contest, students learn to identify their own values and to lay the foundation for good choices throughout their lives.

Another teacher, Janis Collins says, "I just can't sing the program's praises enough." The Templeton Lessons of Life Essay Scholarship contest is just one example of the conscientious effort Tennesseans are making to educate young people on the importance of moral decisionmaking and conduct.

Mr. President, I also want to commend the city of Greeneville, TN, which has put together a character education program featuring 10 community virtues: self-respect, respect for others, perseverance, courtesy, fairness and justice, responsibility, honesty, kindness, self-discipline, and courage.

Greeneville's character education team—concerned teachers, principals, parents, ministers, school psychologists, and education board members—asked themselves what kind of qualities they would like their students to have, and they have volunteered their time to make sure these characteristics are nourished.

I think that the good people of Greeneville have shown the kind of character—the kind of selfless giving—of which America needs so much more.

Mr. President, Tennesseans have joined the national effort to save our children from the moral decay we see all around us because they recognize that the only way to preserve this great democracy—this system that requires so much from each of us—and our American way of life, is to instill virtue and moral fortitude in the next generation of Americans.

This will not happen without our effort, and without the incredible leadership of movements like Character

Counts. Again, I commend Senator DOMENICI, and all those who are working so hard, to make character count once again in the United States of America.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 227—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. D'AMATO, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, reported the following original resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. RES. 227

Resolved,

#### SECTION 1. FUNDS FOR SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

There shall be made available from the contingent fund of the Senate out of the Account for Expenses for Inquiries and Investigations, for use before, on, or after February 29, 1996, by the Special Committee to Investigate Whitewater Development Corporation and Related Matters (hereafter in this Resolution referred to as the "Special Committee"), established by Senate Resolution 120, 104th Congress, agreed to May 17, 1995 (as amended by Senate Resolution 153, 104th Congress, agreed to July 17, 1995) to carry out the investigation, study, and hearings authorized by that Senate Resolution—

(1) a sum equal to not more than \$600,000—

(A) for payment of salaries and other expenses of the Special Committee; and

(B) not more than \$475,000 of which may be used by the Special Committee for the procurement of the services of individual consultants or organizations thereof; and

(2) such additional sums as may be necessary for agency contributions related to the compensation of employees of the Special Committee.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, in open session, to review the role of the Department of Defense Joint Requirements Oversight Council [JROC].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the Finance Committee requests unanimous consent to hold a hearing on the administration's views on the bipartisan proposal of the Governors' on welfare and Medicaid on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, beginning at 10 a.m. in room SD-215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to

meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 2:15 p.m. in SD-226 to hold a nominations hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to hold a business meeting during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Human Resources be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 9 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a hearing on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 9:30 a.m., in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing focusing on S. 917 and S. 942—White House Conference on Small Business: Paperwork Reduction and Regulatory Reform Recommendations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 9:30 a.m. to hold an open hearing on intelligence matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28 at 9:30 a.m. to hold a hearing to discuss mental illness and the elderly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, TECHNOLOGY AND GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Government Information of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 9:30 a.m., in the Senate Dirksen Building room 106 to hold a hearing on legislation to combat economic espionage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

##### SUBCOMMITTEE ON YOUTH VIOLENCE

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Youth Violence of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 28, 1996, at 10 a.m., in the Senate Dirksen Building room 226 to hold a hearing on "the changing nature of youth violence."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### NATIONAL AUTISM AWARENESS MONTH

• Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have long been active in issues of importance for individuals suffering from a mental illness or disability. Through my efforts in this area, I have become familiar with the vast spectrum of these disorders, and I have found that we as a society have much to learn about both the causes and cures for these illnesses. Knowledge of the medical conditions underpinning these disorders has only recently begun to make progress by leaps and bounds, and I fear that public awareness and knowledge has not grown in step. Because society is still unfamiliar with these advances, an aura of fear and suspicion persists with regard to any one of the illnesses or disorders which afflict so many Americans. It is because of this widespread lack of knowledge and understanding that I rise today in recognition of the Autism Society of America's designation of January as "National Autism Awareness Month."

Autism is a neurological disorder that interrupts the brain's ability to process and understand information. Nearly 400,000 Americans suffer from this disorder, making it more prevalent than Down's syndrome or muscular dystrophy.

Autism is a complex, spectrum disorder that manifests itself in many ways. Symptoms and characteristics present themselves in a variety of combinations, and no two children or adults are affected in the same way.

Autism is not curable, but it is treatable. Many types of treatments have proven effective in combating this disorder, and improvements are being discovered every day.

A generation ago, nearly 90 percent of those suffering from autism were placed in an institution. Today, group homes, assisted living arrangements, and home care are much more common. Thanks to the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, many children with autism receive appropriate education and go on to become contributing members of the work force.

In April 1995, in response to direction from Congress, the National Institutes



of Health [NIH] held a State-of-the-Sciences Conference on Autism. Conference participants included scientists, clinicians, and parents. The conference highlighted how far we have come in diagnosing and treating autism, but also illuminated how far we have yet to go. National Autism Awareness Month is designed to bring attention to these issues, and seeks to further the Nation's understanding of this complicated and debilitating disorder. I fully support the Autism Society of America's designation of January as National Autism Awareness Month. I share their goal of teaching America more about this disorder, and I welcome my colleagues' support as well.●

#### AID'S INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM

● Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, about a month ago when we passed the last continuing resolution, I spoke about the damage a provision included in the CR by the House of Representatives would cause to our international family planning programs. Senator HARTFIELD, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, also spoke at that time. We both expressed real concerns about what the House had done, and the effect it would have on the lives of millions of couples around the world especially women.

We also pointed out that the House had essentially handed us a fait accompli, since it recessed immediately thereafter and our only alternative to passing what they sent us in the form they sent it was to close down the Federal Government again. We passed the CR under protest, and I have been very encouraged by the strong stand the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has taken on this issue. He has always been a strong opponent of abortion, but he has also supported family planning and has made the point as eloquently as anyone that the way to reduce the number of abortions is to give couples the means to avoid unwanted pregnancies.

I am not going to repeat all that I said back then. Suffice it to say that as a result of the House action, millions of couples will be denied family planning services, including contraceptives, who want them, need them, and have no other access to them. It does not take a genius to realize that the result will be many more unwanted pregnancies, and many more abortions. In the countries where these family planning programs are carried out, abortion is often unsafe and the incidence of maternal death is alarmingly high.

I cannot believe that was the intent of the authors of the House provision, but how they could have failed to anticipate that result is beyond me. I can only conclude that they do not want the U.S. Government to provide assist-

ance to couples who want to limit their number of children, even though these people want the assistance and many of them live in countries where millions of people go hungry each day.

A February 16, 1996, article in the Baltimore Sun made this same point. Not only does it discuss the steps AID Administrator Atwood has taken to improve efficiency at his agency, it notes that Congress rewarded him by cutting several hundreds of millions of dollars in AID's budget, cuts that I opposed. It cites the example of AID's family planning program, and points out that what the House has done will not only hurt mothers and infants, it will increase the very redtape Congress has been urging AID to cut.

As the article indicates, once again ideology won out over common sense. That seems to be a recurring theme around here.

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Feb. 16, 1996]

#### AID LEARNS THAT GOOD DEEDS DO NOT GO UNPUNISHED

(By Sara Ingram)

When the Clinton Administration preached "reinvention" of government the State Department's Agency for International Development (AID) heeded the call.

Along with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, AID became one of two federal "reinvention laboratories" where all the talk about more efficient more effective and less costly management turned into reality.

AID has shed some 70 senior level positions, each paying about \$100,000 a year. It has slimmed total staffing levels by 16 percent—from 10,800 people to 9,050. It has cut regulations by 55 percent, cut the time it takes to award competitive contracts from a year to 150 days, cut project-design time by 75 percent and overhauled its program operations, procurement, accounting and budget procedures.

#### VIRTUE IS ITS OWN REWARD

And what thanks does it get for doing more with less?

A whopping budget cut, along with potentially devastating restrictions on some programs.

The saga of the 1996 AID budget is one of the grimmer tales of the budget stand-off. The agency never expected an easy ride, given the Republican-controlled Congress' zeal for slashing the budget and the difficulty of defending aid to other countries when we have plenty of poor, homeless and hungry people right here at home.

But the fact is that foreign aid is crucial to advancing U.S. interests around the globe and to making the world a safer place. From nurturing economic activity that raises living standards and slows the rate of illegal immigration, to helping emerging democracies set up a system of law, to providing medical care and family-planning assistance to countries with burgeoning birth rates and high rates of infant and maternal mortality—the agency's programs plant seeds that, eventually, can help forestall political unrest or hostilities that spill over into wider wars.

#### TINY SHARE

Foreign aid is a tiny share of the budget—less than 3 percent (1.2%), and AID gets only

a sixth of that. But a recent poll showed an alarming number of Americans assumed that the government spent more on foreign aid than on Medicare.

Under the compromise finally reached by the Congress and the White House, the agency's budget will be cut 11 percent. Since some aid programs, such as assistance to Egypt and Israel, must hold relatively steady, other programs took an especially hard hit.

None, however, got the shabby treatment reserved for family planning assistance. Those programs, a favorite target of a small House group of zealous opponents of abortion and family-planning, were cut 35 percent, a loss of more than \$200 million from 1995 funding levels. Even worse, these opponents succeeded in requiring that no funds for 1996 be spent before July 1—and then that the allocation be dribbled out in 15 monthly increments, most of which would come, absurdly, after the end of the year for which the money is appropriated.

Since the budget impasse had blocked expenditures after October 1, that requirement creates a nine-month gap—an ironic length—in U.S. aid for family-planning services for some of the poorest families in the world. Clearly, the restrictions are aimed at interrupting these programs, many of which are administered by private, non-profit organizations in countries receiving the aid.

#### DEFEAT FOR FAMILIES

The victory for ideology is a clear defeat for tens of thousands of families who, as a consequence, will experience higher rates of unplanned pregnancies and more deaths among mothers and infants. Pregnancy is a high-risk undertaking in countries where nutrition is poor and health care is inaccessible or primitive.

It's also a defeat for efficient government—and an illustration of how Congress can talk one game and play another. Despite its calls for effective government, Congress can't resist an ideological power play. What else explains a requirement that must have been dreamed up in red-tape heaven?

Instead of one, clean transaction, we'll now have 15 checks and 15 contracts for a program that is underfunded to begin with. Re-inventing government? The bureaucrats are hearing the message. It's the ideologues who, it seems, couldn't care less.●

#### SECRETARY PERRY'S WEHRKUNDE ADDRESS

● Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, earlier this month, I again had the honor of leading the U.S. delegation to the annual Wehrkunde conference on security policy in Munich. This conference serves as a valuable opportunity for policymakers, security analysts, and defense industry leaders from both sides of the Atlantic to exchange views on pressing European security issues and to build the relationships that are the sinews of an alliance.

This year's conference was notable both because it was held as NATO forces were breaking new ground with the IFOR mission in Bosnia and for the participation of senior officials from Central Europe and Russia, including the Russian Deputy Defense Minister, which provided for productive, if sometimes heated, dialog on NATO enlargement.

The conference thus offered an appropriate setting for a speech by Secretary of Defense Perry in which he outlined a vision for the future of the Atlantic alliance and its relationship with Russia, based on the accomplishments of the past and the current cooperation in Bosnia. Secretary Perry is to be commended for laying out a thoughtful and challenging agenda for addressing the issues currently facing the Alliance. I also want to commend him for not only weaving the words of T.S. Eliot into his remarks, but for ferreting out the little known fact that Eliot was on the stage half a century ago when George Marshall gave the speech that became the Marshall plan.

Mr. President, I think all Senators would benefit from reading Secretary Perry's Wehrkunde address and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WILLIAM J. PERRY

Behind my desk at the Pentagon hangs a portrait of the great statesman, George C. Marshall, Marshall, who was the third Secretary of Defense in the United States, is a role model of mine. He had a great vision for Europe—a Europe which from the Atlantic to the Urals was united in peace, freedom and democracy; and a strong trans-Atlantic partnership sustained by bipartisan political support in the United States.

Marshall not only had this vision, he also had a plan to make this vision a reality in post-war Europe. And in a famous speech at Harvard University in 1947, he outlined what came to be called the Marshall Plan.

A little known fact is that joining Marshall on the dais that day was the famous poet, T.S. Eliot, who 10 years earlier had written:

Footfalls echo in the memory  
Down the passage we did not take  
Towards the door we never opened.

These words by T.S. Eliot foreshadowed the fate of Marshall's plan in Eastern and Central Europe. Because on that day, 50 years ago, as the footfalls of World War II still echoed across a shattered continent, the Marshall Plan offered Europe a new passage toward reconstruction and renewal. Half of Europe took this passage, and opened the door to prosperity and freedom. Half of Europe was denied this passage when Joseph Stalin slammed the door on Marshall's offer. And for 50 years, the footfalls of what might have been echoed in our memories.

Today, as the Cold War becomes an echo in our memory, we have a second chance to make Marshall's vision a reality: To go down the passage we did not take 50 years ago, towards the door we never opened. Behind that door lies George Marshall's Europe. To open this door, we do not need a second Marshall Plan, but we do need to draw on Marshall's vision.

Marshall recognized that peace, democracy and prosperity were ultimately inseparable. And Marshall understood that if you identify what people desire most, and provide them with a path to reach it, then they will do the hard work necessary to achieve their goals.

In the late 1940s what Western European countries desired most was to rebuild their societies and economies. And the Marshall Plan provided a path for achieving this goal. By taking this passage, the nations of Western Europe built an economic powerhouse.

And along the way, they built strong democracies and a strong security institution called NATO.

Today, countries in the other half of Europe are struggling to rebuild their societies and economies, and the one thing they all desire is greater security. NATO's challenge is to provide these Europeans a path for achieving their security goal. And along the way, we want them very much to develop strong democracies and strong economies.

This other half of Europe includes the nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States. It includes Russia. And it includes the nations of the former Yugoslavia. Today, NATO is reaching out to all three areas and providing a path to Marshall's Europe.

The primary path NATO has provided is the Partnership for Peace. Just as the Marshall Plan worked because it was rooted firmly in the self-interest of both the United States and Europe, so too does the Partnership for Peace work because it is rooted firmly in the self-interest of both NATO and the Partner nations.

PFPP is bringing the newly free nations of Europe and the former Soviet Union into the security architecture of Europe as a whole. Our nations are working and training together in military joint exercises. But make no mistake, the Partnership for Peace is more than just joint exercises. Just as the Marshall Plan had an impact well beyond the economies of Western Europe, PFPP is echoing beyond the security realm in Central and Eastern Europe, and into the political and economic realms as well.

Just as the Marshall Plan used economic revival as the catalyst for political stabilization—and ultimately the development of the modern Europe—the PFPP uses security cooperation as a catalyst for political and economic reform.

PFPP members are working to uphold democracy, tolerate diversity, respect the rights of minorities and respect freedom of expression. They are working to build market economies. They are working hard to develop democratic control of their military forces, to be good neighbors and respect the sovereign rights outside their borders. And they are working hard to make their military forces compatible with NATO.

For those Partner countries that are embracing PFPP as a passage to NATO membership, these actions are a key to opening that door. For many of these nations, aspiration to NATO membership has become the rock on which all major political parties base their platforms. It is providing the same overlapping consensus that NATO membership engenders in NATO countries, making compromise and reconciliation possible.

In Hungary, all six major political parties in the Parliament united to pass a resolution in support of IFOR, the Bosnia peace implementation force, by a vote of 300 to 1. In Poland, the new President—a former member of the former communist party—re-affirmed Poland's NATO aspirations. In Slovakia, Hungary and Rumania, governments are quietly resolving border disputes, and putting into place protection for ethnic minorities. For these countries, the Partnership for Peace is becoming a passage to democracy and market reform, as well as a passage to security cooperation with the West.

But even those countries that do not aspire to NATO membership are realizing many of the same political and social gains from active participation in the PFPP. Moreover, PFPP is providing them the tools and the opportunities to develop closer ties to NATO,

and learn from NATO—even as they choose to remain outside the Alliance. And PFPP is building bonds among the Partner nations—even outside the framework of cooperation with NATO.

That is why defense ministers from many Partner nations have said to me that even if, or when, they eventually join NATO, they want to sustain their active participation in PFPP. In short, by creating the Partnership for Peace, NATO is doing more than just building the basis for enlargement. It is, in fact, creating a new zone of security and stability throughout Europe.

That is why I believe that the creation of the Partnership for Peace has been one of the most significant events of the post-Cold War era. By forging networks of people and institutions working together to preserve freedom, promote democracy and build free markets, the PFPP today is a catalyst for transforming Central and Eastern Europe, much as Marshall Plan transformed Western Europe in the '40s and '50s. It is the passage this half of Europe did not take in 1947; it is the door that we never opened.

To lock in the gains of reform, NATO must ensure that the ties we are creating in PFPP continue to deepen and that we actually proceed with the gradual and deliberate, but steady, process of outreach and enlargement to the East. NATO enlargement is inevitable. And if NATO enlargement is a carrot encouraging reforms, then we cannot keep that carrot continually out of reach. So it is critical that we implement the second phase of NATO enlargement agreed upon at the NAC Ministerial Meeting in December.

And even as some countries join NATO, it will be important to keep the door open for others down the road. We must make sure that PFPP continues to provide a place in the security architecture of Europe so that we keep the door open to Marshall's Europe even for those nations that do not aspire to become NATO members.

For Marshall's vision to be truly fulfilled, one of the nations that must walk through this door is Russia. Russia has been a key player in Europe's security for over 300 years. It will remain a key player in the coming decades, for better or for worse. Our job is to make it for the better.

Unlike with the Marshall Plan 50 years ago, Russia today has chosen to participate in the Partnership for Peace. And in the spirit of Marshall, we welcome Russia's participation, and hope that over time it will take on a leading role in PFPP commensurate with its importance as a great power.

But for Russia to join us as a full and active partner in completing Marshall's vision, NATO and Russia need to build on our common ground, even when we don't agree with each other's conclusions. It is fair to say that most members of Russia's political establishment do not welcome or even accept NATO's plans for enlargement. Anybody that doubted that yesterday, if you heard Mr. Kokoshin's speech, realized the extent of the opposition to NATO enlargement in Russia.

When I was in Russia last June, I had a number of conversations with Russian government leaders and Duma members about the future of European security. I offered them a series of postulates about that future. I told them if I were in Russia's shoes, I would want the future security picture in Europe to have the following characteristics:

First, I said, if I were a Russian leader, I would want the United States to be involved in the security of Europe. They agreed with that postulate.

Then, I said, if I were a Russian leader, I would want to see Germany an integrated



part of the European security structure. And they agreed with that postulate.

And third, I said, if I were a Russian leader, I would want Russia to be in the security architecture of Europe, not isolated outside of it. They agreed with this postulate also.

Finally, I asked them how could a Russian leader best achieve these goals?

I concluded they could only be achieved through a healthy and vibrant NATO. That is NATO, far from being a threat to Russia, actually contributes to the security of Russia, as well as to the security of its own members.

When I reached that conclusion most of the Russians I talked to fell off the cliff. They agreed with each of my premises—but they did not agree with my conclusion. But in the absence of NATO and its partnership arrangements, I do not see any way of achieving those goals—our shared goals—of a safe and peaceful Europe.

I have to tell you that I did not persuade my Russian colleagues with my argument. But, I do believe that as Russia deepens its involvement with NATO, it will come to believe in the truth of my conclusion, as well as my premises. And I believe that Russia will want to have a cooperative relation with NATO and a leading role in the Partnership for Peace. And that Russia will come to understand that enlargement means enlarging a zone of security and stability that is very much in Russia's interest, not a threat to Russia.

But the way for this new understanding to occur is for NATO to continue to reach out to Russia not only from the top down but from the bottom up. Last year at Wehrkunde, I proposed that NATO and Russia begin a separate plan of activities, outside the Partnership for Peace. Since then, we have all discussed and even agreed upon this proposal in principle, but we have not yet put it on paper. We must do so. We cannot let disagreements over the "theology" of building NATO-Russia relations get in the way of "here and now" opportunities to work together where our interests clearly overlap. Instead of letting theology dictate our practice, we should let our practice shape our theology.

One example of where the United States is already doing this is with our program of bilateral training exercises with Russia. We have held four such exercises in the last year, each a great success, and each conducted in a spirit of trust and goodwill. This summer, the United States and Russia will move beyond the bilateral and jointly participate in a major regional Partnership for Peace exercise with forces from Ukraine, Russia, United States and other regional powers.

Our bilateral contact program with Russia is not confined to joint exercises or even to just the security field. Through the Gore-Chernomyrdin Commission, it extends to the fields of science and technology, space, defense conversion, business development, the environment, health care and agriculture.

Just this past week the Commission met in Washington, and Mr. Kokoshin and I both participated in the defense conversion program of this Commission. I urge all NATO nations to build on this model. These contacts provide important exchanges of information. They help break down years of distrust and suspicion. They weave the Russians into the kind of personal and professional networks that have long characterized relations among all of the Allies. These are the kind of activities that will build trust between Russia and NATO. And these are the

kind of activities that will keep Russia on the passage toward integration with Europe, to pass through that open door.

Mr. Grachev and I attended the joint U.S. exercise in Kansas last October. And we met after the exercise with the American and the Russian soldiers conducting that exercise, and talked to them. He told the Russian soldiers what they were doing was very important, that they should extend their friendship and cooperation with the American soldiers, and that this was the basis for creating a peaceful world for their children. The American soldiers were as much interested in what he was saying as the Russians were, I can assure you.

Ironically, the place where a distinct NATO-Russia relationship is occurring in practice is in Bosnia. Today, as we speak, a Russian brigade is serving in the American Multinational Division of IFOR. It took an enormous amount of work to make this happen. Minister Grachev and I met four times over a two month period to iron out the details. Generals Joulwan and Nash work closely every day with their counterparts, General Shevtsov and Colonel Lentsov. NATO and Russia do have a special relationship today in Bosnia, and Russia is demonstrating its commitment to participating in the future security architecture of Europe.

The reason we are all working so hard to make this relationship successful is not just because of the additional troops Russia brings to Bosnia, but because Russia's participation in Bosnia casts a very long shadow that will have an impact on the security of Europe for years to come. When we deal with the most important security problem which Europe has faced since the Cold War was over, we want to have Russia inside the circle, working with us, not outside the circle, throwing rocks at us.

Indeed, the more you think about what NATO and Russia are doing together in Bosnia, the more amazing it becomes. I can only imagine what General Eisenhower, the first SACEUR, would think if he saw a General from Russia sitting with General Joulwan, today's SACEUR, at the SHAPE compound reviewing a secret NATO OPLAN. We need to build on this model, to institutionalize it, and expand it to cover the entire range of NATO and Russia's overlapping security interests. By so doing, NATO and Russia can move forward as full partners in completing Marshall's vision.

Just as the NATO-Russia relationship is being forged in Bosnia, so too is the future of NATO itself. I was in Bosnia several weeks ago. I was struck by the dedication and professionalism of every unit from every country that is participating. I was also struck by the stark contrast between the devastation and suffering I saw in Sarajevo, and the rebirth and renewal I have seen in the other capitals of Central and Eastern Europe.

Bosnia is what happens when newly independent nations focus on old hatreds instead of new challenges. Four years ago, some people in the former Yugoslavia chose not to join Marshall's Europe. And the death and bloodshed that resulted will long echo in our memory. But today the door to Marshall's Europe is open again for them—and holding that door open are NATO, Russia and the newly free peoples of Central and Eastern Europe.

The success or failure of IFOR is crucial to whether or not we will complete Marshall's vision. It is in Bosnia where we are sending the message that NATO is the bedrock on which the future security and stability of

Europe will be built. It is in Bosnia where NATO is first reaping the benefits of joint peacekeeping training with our new Peace Partners. It is in Bosnia where future NATO members are showing themselves ready and able to shoulder the burdens of membership. And it is in Bosnia where we are showing that we can work as partners with Russian forces. Bosnia is not a peacekeeping exercise. It is the real thing.

Bosnia is also teaching us important lessons about the kind of NATO that Marshall's Europe will require. Ever since the end of the Cold War, NATO has struggled to develop a mechanism for executing the new missions using NATO assets with the voluntary participation of NATO members.

In the conference room, we have so far failed to come up with an agreement on a Combined Joint Task Force, CJTF. But in the field, we have cut through these theological arguments and put together IFOR, which is CJTF. As with the NATO-Russia relationship, we need to take the practical lessons learned in putting IFOR together and extrapolate back until we have a CJTF that works.

Bosnia also casts in sharp relief something we have suspected for some time: that it is time for NATO to adapt itself internally to deal with the new challenges of this new era. NATO was not well structured for the Bosnia mission. At a time when our political and geostrategic thinking has been completely reoriented, symbolized by our partnership in peacekeeping with former adversaries, and at a time when our individual military forces have streamlined and modernized for the battlefield of the future, NATO's command and decision-making structure is still geared for the challenges and the battlefields of the past. The time has come to streamline and modernize NATO, recognizing that our challenge is no longer simply to execute a known plan with already designated forces, as it was during the Cold War.

We must make NATO's command structure more responsive and more flexible, and streamline the planning and force preparation process, and simplify and speed-up the entire decision-making process. And we must complete the task of giving NATO's European members a stronger identity within the alliance. These kinds of internal changes will ready NATO for enlargement, and will allow us to better respond to the future challenges to European security and stability.

It is in this context that we welcome the French decision to participate more fully in NATO's military bodies. And we look forward to working with France as we transform the Alliance and realize Marshall's vision of a Europe united in peace, freedom and democracy.

In 1947, Marshall told America that it must "face up to the responsibility which history has placed upon our country." Today, it is not only America, but also Russia; is not only NATO nations, but all of Europe—all of us must face up to the responsibility which history has placed upon us. This means reaching out to each other not only in the spirit of friendship, but also in the spirit of self-interest. This means working towards our goals not only from the top-down, but also the ground-up. And it means recognizing that when the outside world changes, we must look inside our institutions and see what changes are needed there.

If we do these things, then next year, when we commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the Marshall Plan, we will be able to say that we made Marshall's vision our own.

February 28, 1996

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

3081

That Partnership for Peace is a strong, permanent pillar of Europe's security architecture. That NATO and Russia have a relationship where trust, understanding and cooperation are givens, not goals. That all the nations of the former Yugoslavia are adding, not detracting, from Europe's security. And that we have taken the passage to a new Europe and opened the door to a new era of peace, freedom and democracy.

Thank you very much.●

PROGRAM

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, immediately following morning business tomorrow, the Senate will begin 30 minutes of debate on the motion to invoke cloture on the D.C. appropriations conference report.

Senators should be aware that the cloture vote on the conference report will occur at 12:30 p.m. on Thursday.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 1:35 p.m., recessed until Thursday, February 29, 1996, at 11 a.m.